

SITE PLAN ATTACHED

06. 3 CLIVEDEN CLOSE SHENFIELD ESSEX CM15 8JP

FIRST FLOOR FRONT EXTENSION, HIPPED ROOF TO REPLACE FLAT ROOF, THREE DORMERS TO REAR AND REMOVAL OF THE CHIMNEY. PART TWO STOREY AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO INCLUDE ROOFLIGHTS.

APPLICATION NO: 15/01393/FUL

WARD	Shenfield	8/13 WEEK DATE	16.12.2015
PARISH		POLICIES	
CASE OFFICER	Ms Sukhi Dhadwar	01277 312500	
Drawing no(s) relevant to this decision:	01; 02; PS2916.1; PS2916.2; PS2916.3; 03 - SECOND FLOOR; 04 - EXISTING;		

This application was referred by Cllr Clark for consideration by the Committee.
The reason(s) are as follows:

Concerns are that policies are being interpreted subjectively rather than objectively so that the difference between what is refused in this case and has been allowed in neighbouring houses is not clear.

1. Proposals

This application is a resubmission of the previously refused scheme under 15/00979/FUL. The applicant did not request any post application advice in relation to that refusal and instead has resubmitted the same scheme without any further amendments. The comments made within the previous application therefore still stand.

Permission is sought to remodel the front of the house to create a first floor above the forward projecting part of the garage with a hipped roof. This addition would project from a vertical extension of the main front wall of the house which would also have a hipped roof. A third hipped roof is proposed to replace the flat roof of an existing dormer. Further alterations are proposed to the rear roof plane where two narrow gabled dormers are proposed towards each side of the roof with a wider flat roofed dormer with heavy corncicing between them.

A two storey rear extension is proposed to "square off" the north east corner of the house together with a full-width single-storey rear extension. All materials are proposed to match the existing.

2. Policy Context

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)

Of particular relevance to this application are the following policies:

Paragraph 14 of the NPPF sets out that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development ; in decision making, this means approving proposals that accord with the development plan without delay, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefit or; specific policies within the Framework indicate that development should be restricted.

Chapter 7: (Requiring Good Design) makes clear that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Design policies should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area. Permission should be refused for development of poor design.

The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) provides additional guidance which supports the National Planning Policy Framework and provides users of the planning system with a specific body of advice and reference. All decisions upon planning applications must now have regard to NPPG as a material consideration.

Brentwood Replacement Local Plan

CP1 (General Development Criteria) requires development to satisfy a range of criteria covering the following considerations: Character and appearance of the area; Residential amenities; Access; Highway safety; Environmental protection; and the Natural and Historic Environment.

H17 (Dormer Windows) will not permit dormer windows which are out of scale and poorly related in design to the roof in which they will be installed. Dormers should be subsidiary rather than dominant feature of the roof, be set in from any wall of the property and be below the ridge height.

3. Relevant History

- 15/00423/FUL: Construction of a detached outbuilding -Application Permitted
- 15/00979/FUL: First floor front extension, hipped roof to replace flat roof, three dormers to rear and removal of the chimney. Part two storey and single storey rear extension to include rooflights. -Application Refused

4. Neighbour Responses

Letters were sent to occupants of adjoining and nearby properties. A site notice was also displayed. At the time of the writing of this report no responses had been received.

5. Consultation Responses

- **Design Officer:**

The existing property is located within a characterful residential location in close proximity to Shenfield. The context of the site evidences a variety of dwellings, a mix of bungalows, houses and chalet style dwellings with a fairly consistent scale and use of local vernacular materials e.g. brick and render. The existing property of 3 Cliveden Close is characterful, derived of Arts and Crafts architecture with accentuated roof lines and well proportioned openings.

Having now assessed this current submission I raise objection on Design Grounds to the proposals within this application. In the first instance the treatment at the principle frontage is contextually inappropriate and of poor design; the introduction of pitched/hipped elements and associated gables is adding a disproportionate weight of form into the roof plane; this would be highly visible in the street scene and harmful to the local distinctiveness of the location. In addition to the introduction of these forms the new fenestration is not sufficiently considered; e.g. the third storey window (casement) and indeed the whole hierarchy of fenestration has not been successfully approached under this current scheme. Furthermore, there are issues with the rear elevation and the design intent; although less visible from the public realm the rear fenestration and confusion of styles is particularly evident, e.g. a flatted central dormer adjacent to two pitched dormer elements is proposed - this is over dominant in the roofscape and should be reconsidered.

In terms of detail intent the existing elements which contribute to the character of the existing property are proposed to be removed e.g the tile creasing at the existing garage (as shown on the existing drawings) will be removed to facilitate the two storey front gable; I advise even should the two storey gable be accepted in planning terms, the diminution of characterful details is not led by a strong design intent - it is simply not considered sufficiently.

Consequently there are fundamental issues with the Design proposed, particularly at the frontage, these cannot be overcome through the application of Conditions. The cumulative impact of poorly designed elements within this domestic dwelling I advise will be harmful to the character of the area.

In summary I advise this application is not one of Good Design in accordance with National Policy. I recommend this application for refusal.

6. Summary of Issues

The main issues in relation to this application are:

Impact on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area;
Impact on the living conditions of surrounding residential properties

Character and appearance

Cliveden Close is fronted by a variety of houses, bungalows and chalets. The buildings are finished in combinations of brick, tile and render and in the vicinity of the appeal property a number of the dwellings, including No 3, have low eaves lines, small dormers and eaves and window detailing which creates an attractive "Arts and Crafts" feel which is characteristic of parts of Shenfield.

The proposal would increase the area of the vertical surfaces at the front of the building and extend these above the original eaves line. The introduction of three hipped roofs of different sizes and different eaves levels together with a front-facing half gable would result in a poorly designed and disjointed appearance at the front of the house. The additional area and height of the front facing walls, together with the bulk of the hipped roofs would result in an unbalanced and assertive appearance that would materially detract from the character and appearance of this attractive dwelling and would fail respond to the distinctiveness of this part of Shenfield.

The rear of the house is not open to general public view; however the proposal would result in the rear roof plane being dominated by two different designs of dormer window neither of which have any regard to the design and character of the host dwelling. The rear dormer would conflict with RLP Policy H17 which indicates that dormer windows should be subsidiary rather than dominant features of roofs and that those which are out of scale and poorly designed will not be permitted.

The proposal would unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling and the immediate area and would not accord with the objectives of RLP Policy CP1 (i) and (iii) as regards the character and appearance of new buildings. The dormers would conflict with RLP Policy H17 which indicates that dormer windows should be subsidiary rather than dominant features of roofs and that those which are out of scale and poorly designed will not be permitted. The proposal would conflict with one of the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that planning should always seek a high quality of design and that new development should reflect local distinctiveness.

These findings are supported by the Design Officer who in her detailed appraisal of the application noted above considers that the proposed extension will result in a development which will be both incongruous to the application property and will undermine the character and appearance of the wider street scene.

The applicant has raised the example of number other front extensions within this road. The most recent being 4 Cliveden Close which was originally built to the same design as that at number 3 Cliveden Close, but which has since been extended by the addition of a part two storey and part single storey front extension and rear dormers. These extensions were approved under reference planning permission reference 08/00665/FUL. This approved design respects the existing eaves level of the original house and provides additional space to provide a stair case into the second floor. The applicant and agent have already been advised of alternative designs which would be acceptable, however these suggestions were not taken up.

Living conditions

The house at No 3 is stepped back from the neighbouring house to the south east (No 2) and is positioned forward of No 4. However the house at No 2 has been extended at the rear to with its rear wall being just over 1m forward of No 3. The single storey rear extension would be off-set from the boundary by about 1m and would extend back 3.3m from the existing rear wall. It would lie to the north west of the garden of No 2 and it is considered that it would not have an unacceptably harmful effect on light or outlook at the rear of No 2. The two-storey infill and single storey addition would be alongside the flank wall of No 4 and would have no adverse effect on the occupiers of that property. Main windows face to the front and rear and the proposal would not result in unacceptable overlooking.

The proposal would not conflict with Policy CP1 (ii) of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan which indicates that developments should not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of nearby occupiers. It would not conflict with one of the core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings should always be sought.

Conclusion

The application has not demonstrated any new material consideration to override the original reason to refuse this development under reference 15/00979/FUL.

The original objections raised therefore still stand. The reasons for those objections are based on sound design principles which are embedded in both local and national planning policy. The development would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate area, in conflict with Local and National Planning Policy.

7. **Recommendation**

The Application be REFUSED for the following reasons:-

R1 U11874

The proposal would result in a poorly designed and disjointed appearance at the front of the house that would result in an unbalanced and assertive appearance and poorly designed and uncharacteristic rear dormers that would materially detract from the character and appearance of this attractive dwelling and would fail respond to the distinctiveness of this part of Shenfield. The dormers would conflict with RLP Policy H17 which indicates that dormer windows should be subsidiary rather than dominant features of roofs and that those which are out of scale and poorly designed will not be permitted. The proposal would not accord with the objectives of RLP Policy CP1 (i) and (iii) as regards the character and appearance of new buildings. It would conflict with one of the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that planning should always seek a high quality of design and that new development should reflect local distinctiveness.

Informative(s)

1 INF24

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal – which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

2 INF05

The following development plan policies contained in the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 are relevant to this decision: CP1, H17 the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and NPPG 2014.

3 INF20

The drawing numbers listed above are relevant to this decision

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

DECIDED: