

**SITE PLAN ATTACHED**

**59 PETRESFIELD WAY WEST HORNDON BRENTWOOD ESSEX CM13 3TG**

**DEMOLISH EXISTING CONSERVATORY. CONSTRUCTION OF TWO-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY SIDE/REAR EXTENSION, LOFT CONVERSION TO INCLUDE 2 X PITCHED GABLES TO REAR, INSERTION OF 4 X ROOFLIGHTS TO FRONT ELEVATION AND ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION.**

**APPLICATION NO: 22/01282/HHA**

<b>WARD</b>	Herongate, Ingrave & West Horndon	<b>8/13 WEEK DATE</b>	4 November 2022
<b>PARISH</b>	West Horndon	<b>POLICIES</b>	BE05, NE09, BE14
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	Miss Georgia Taylor	01277 312620	
<b>Drawing no(s) relevant to this decision:</b>	A.001; A.002; A.003; Site & Block Plan;		

A Planning Referral Request was submitted by West Horndon Parish Council for the following reason:

*Proposed works are large and bulky and will create privacy issues for neighbouring properties. Also, there is a substantial increase in habitable space leading to an increased off street parking requirement. Proposed works make no allowance for this. This will lead to increase on street parking. The property has a shared drive arrangement with neighbouring properties. This has been identified as a future area for conflict given the increased parking need.*

**1. Proposals**

Demolish existing conservatory. Construction of two-storey side extension, single storey side/rear extension, loft conversion to include 2 x pitched gables to rear, insertion of 4 x rooflights to front elevation and alterations to fenestration.

**2. Policy Context**

The Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033

The Plan was adopted as the Development Plan for the Borough on 23 March 2022. At the same time the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan, August 2005 (saved policies, August 2008) was revoked.

National Planning Policy and Guidance

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)
- Policy BE14: Creating Successful Places

### **3. Relevant History**

- 22/00577/HHA: Proposed loft conversion to create rear dormer to include x5 roof lights. Single storey side and rear extension to include x4 rooflights. Height increase to existing porch to include x1 rooflight and alterations to fenestration.  
-Application Refused

### **4. Neighbour Responses**

Two neighbour objections were received during the initial neighbour consultation process with the following comments -

- No alterations made to the size of the development from the previous application
- No surrounding properties have a dormer window or Juliette balcony enabling exposed viewing to adjacent properties
- Additional bedrooms would increase parking which is currently maximised.
- The proposal seeks to show garden converted into parking spaces which would cause potential flooding issues
- Current driveway has access to three properties (No. 57, 59 and 61), and the proposed construction would result in disruption
- Discrepancies within the plans – application form and drawings appear to contradict themselves.
- Not opposed to extension, but the proposed is excessive in size and would be disruptive.
- Extension is overly large and bulky, and is out of keeping with the character of the area
- Loss of light from proposed single storey side extension
- Proposed dormer windows which although improved, are still considered obtrusive.
- Concerns regarding the waste.

Neighbours and the parish council were re-consulted following a correction to the description of the development to include a two storey extension. Following the re-consultation, a further neighbour comment was received with the following comments

- Loss of privacy to houses to the rear of the site.

- The proposal does not appear to be in line with the Brentwood Local Plan due to the reduced garden space.
- The proposed extensions are considered excessive in size.
- The area of West Horndon is located within a flood zone area, and any effect on drainage would result in risk to surrounding dwellings.

## 5. Consultation Responses

- **Parish Council:**

Parish Councillors noted that the proposed works were extensive and bulky. Given the increase in size of the property Parish Councillors believed that considerable privacy and parking problems would be experienced by neighbouring properties. It was expected that concerns would be raised by nearby properties and the Parish Council fully supported any comments submitted to the planning department regarding potential intrusion on living conditions for adjacent homes.

### ***Second response:***

Parish Councillors continued to be of the view that the proposed works were extensive and bulky. Indeed, following the clarification that a two storey side extension is proposed the works were regarded as even bulkier. Given the increase in size of the property Parish Councillors believed that considerable privacy and parking problems would be experienced by neighbouring properties. It is known that the occupants of both neighbouring houses hold objections to the proposed works and the Parish Council supports them in believing that this planning application should be refused.

In the period since submitting views on the first description of the proposed works, the Parish Council has written to Essex Highways seeking clarification on (a) why it was believed that sufficient off street parking remained within the curtilage of the property given the significant proposed increase in habitable space; and (b) if a site visit had been undertaken to appreciate the problems posed by the shared driveway arrangement with neighbouring properties. Unfortunately, the Parish Council still awaits a reply.

- **Highway Authority:**

The information that was submitted in association with the application has been fully considered by the Highway Authority.

The proposal retains adequate room for off-street parking within the curtilage, therefore:

From a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority subject to the following condition:

1. Areas within the curtilage of the site for the purpose of the reception and storage of building materials shall be identified clear of the highway.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate loading / unloading facilities are available to ensure that the highway is not obstructed during the construction period in the interest of highway safety in accordance with policy DM1.

The above condition is to ensure that the proposal conforms to the relevant policies contained within the County Highway Authority's Development Management Policies, adopted as County Council Supplementary Guidance in February 2011.

## **6. Summary of Issues**

Planning permission is sought to construct a two-storey side extension, a single storey side and rear extension, rear dormer windows and insert roof lights at the front of the house to facilitate a loft room conversion. The extensions would accommodate 1 additional bedroom on the ground floor, and 1 additional bedroom in the loft space.

### Site Description

The application site is located on the east side of Petresfield Way, West Horndon and comprises a two-storey detached dwelling, with a link detached garage shared with No. 57. The site is set in a corner plot of a turning head and abuts the rear gardens of dwellings in Thorndon Avenue to the east and open fields to the north. The house is accessed by a shared drive with its immediate neighbours, No. 57 and No.61.

The dwellings in Petresfield Way are a mixture of two storey detached dwellings of similar designs.

### Site History

Planning permission was recently refused for a similar development at 59 Petresfield Way under planning application 22/00577/HHA for the following reasons:

#### **R1**

*The proposed single storey rear extension would result in an unneighbourly addition along the full width of the common boundary with No. 57, resulting in an overbearing extension, detrimental to the enjoyment of the garden the occupiers should expect to experience. This is in conflict with Policy BE14 of the BLP and the NPPF.*

#### **R2**

*The proposed rear dormer, by way of its scale and design, would result in a bulky and dominant addition in the rear roofscape which would be to the detriment of both visual amenity and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the front first floor extension to the hallway result in a disproportionate vertical addition,*

*harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area. As such, the proposals are in conflict with Policy BE14 of the BLP, the NPPF and the NPPG.*

It should be noted that under provision of off-street parking was not a reason for refusal and the effect on neighbours living conditions was focused on no.57. Therefore the revised application need only seek to overcome the previous reasons for refusal while not creating new issues from a new design.

Pre-application was undertaken following the submission of the current application.

### Design, Character, and Appearance

The previous application sought to construct a single storey side/rear extension with an 'L-shape' design that extended along the entire depth of the common boundary with No. 57, resulting in 8.9 m long built form. The current proposal seeks to construct an 'L' shaped single storey side/rear extension but the depth along the boundary has been reduced to 6 metres, with a mono pitch roof design, a maximum height of 3 metres and an eaves height of 2.3 metres. This is considered to overcome the first reason for refusal by reducing the depth along the boundary.

The current proposal has altered the design, style, and size of the proposed rear dormer by constructing two triangular pitched roofs with a flat roof link between. The roof of the dormer would be below the ridge height of the main house and it would be set in from each side of the roofscape; the triangle pitched sides have reduced the bulk of the dormer extension from the refused scheme and improved the design, therefore it overcomes the second reason for refusal.

The existing conservatory would be removed and, in its place, a two-storey, gable end extension would be constructed to a depth of 3 metres and a width of 5.9 metres. The ridge line of the main dwelling would be continued with eaves to match the existing; materials would also match. A full floor to ceiling height window is proposed at second floor.

The proposed alterations and fenestration include the insertion of 4 x rooflights to the front elevation which are set high within the roof scape and would enable natural light into the rooms within the roof.

Overall the design of the extensions are considered acceptable and would not have a harmful effect on the visual amenity or character and appearance of the surrounding area, and is compliant with the design criteria of policy BE14 of the Brentwood Local Plan.

### Impact on Neighbour Amenity

#### **No. 57**

The immediate neighbouring dwelling No. 57 is located to the south and is positioned forward to the application site, closer to the highway. The attached garage is sited further back, forming one half of the double. It is considered that the reduced depth of the extension is much improved and no longer be a dominant overbearing addition. The proposed two storey element would be located at the other side of the application dwelling and have no effect on these neighbours living conditions by way of loss of light or overbearing. As the application property is set further back from no. 57 there would be no harmful overlooking into the rear garden from the rear dormer.

#### **No. 61**

The neighbouring dwelling No. 61 is set due west; the two-storey extension would be 4.7m away from the shared boundary and located on the north facing elevation. It would be far enough away from the neighbour so as to not result in a loss of light or overshadowing to habitable rooms; the windows proposed on this elevation would face towards open fields; oblique glimpses of the very rear of the back garden of no. 61 may occur but not to the detriment of their living conditions or to result in material overlooking.

#### **No. 167 Thorndon Avenue**

The neighbouring dwelling No. 167 is due east; the houses in this part of Thorndon Avenue have long gardens that abut the common boundary. The distance from the rear of the application site to the rear of 167 is approximately 56m. Given this distance it is considered that the proposed development would not be of a size or design to result in loss of light, have an overbearing impact or result in overlooking leading to a loss of privacy.

#### Highway Matters

The proposal does not include any changes to be made to the existing access and the parking arrangements will remain as existing. The driveway access is shared between 3 dwellings (Nos. 57, 59 and 61), the application site can accommodate two off-street parking spaces which complies with the Brentwood Borough adopted parking standards, and the Highway Authority has not raised any concerns with the parking provision provided. It is further noted that on-street parking restrictions apply.

#### Other Matters

Comments have been raised in regard to drainage and flooding, however the site does not lie within the critical drainage area or a flood zone area and therefore does not require specific mitigation to be introduced. The extensions would not reduce the private garden space for the occupiers of the application site to an unacceptable level.

Procedural matters:

The recommendation was listed on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2022 although the overall consultation period for comments to be received did not expire until 1<sup>st</sup> November. The published recommendation did not preclude further comments from being received or reported or from a request to refer the application to planning committee, but it would allow the application to be determined by its formal target date of 4<sup>th</sup> November should no substantively different comments be received that would alter the recommendation.

Conclusion

The development would not harm the living conditions of surrounding occupiers and the extensions for the main part are not seen from Petersfield Way. The revised plans are considered to overcome the previous reasons for refusal and in all other respects, the proposal would comply with Local Plan Policy BE14.

**7. Recommendation**

The Application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:-

1 TIM01 Standard Time - Full

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 DRA01A Development in accordance with drawings

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the approved documents listed above and specifications.

Reason: To ensure that the development is as permitted by the local planning authority and for the avoidance of doubt.

3 MAT03 Materials to match

The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Reason: In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Informative(s)

1 INF04

The permitted development must be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings and specification. If you wish to amend your proposal you will need formal permission from the Council. The method of obtaining permission depends on the nature of the amendment and you are advised to refer to the Council's web site or take professional advice before making your application.

2 INF05

The following development plan policies contained in the Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 are relevant to this decision: BE14 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).

3 INF21

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### *BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS*

#### **DECIDED:**



