

Reference: 17/00470/FUL	Site: 3 Longley Mews Grays Essex RM16 3AG
Ward: Chadwell St Mary	Proposal: Front extension and dormer to garage and conversion to self-contained annexe.

Plan Number(s):		
Reference	Name	Received
16.274.01	Existing Plans	7th April 2017
16.274.02	Existing and Proposed Plans	7th April 2017
003	Location Plan	7th April 2017

The application is also accompanied by: N/A	
Applicant: Miss Lee	Validated: 18 April 2017 Date of expiry: 30 June 2017 (Extension of time agreed with applicant)
Recommendation: To Refuse	

This application is scheduled for determination by the Planning Committee because it has been Called-In by Councillors G Rice, B Rice, Liddiard, Holloway and C Kent to consider the impact of the development upon the Green Belt and the immediate residential area.

1.0 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This application seeks planning permission for the conversion and extension of the existing garage to a self-contained annexe.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The property comprises of a two storey, garage-linked, dwelling sat in a relatively substantial plot at the north western end of the cul-de-sac of Longley Mews.

The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt.

3.0 RELEVANT HISTORY

Application Reference	Description of Development	Decision
13/00451/HHA	Conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation; new detached garage with store room and additional dormer to front elevation	Refused
13/00720/HHA	Conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation; new detached garage with store room and additional dormer to front elevation	Permitted
16/00992/FUL	Proposed front extension and dormer to garage and subsequent conversion to self-contained annexe.	Refused & Appeal Dismissed
16/01643/FUL	Proposed change of use of detached garage to self-contained annexe.	Permitted

4.0 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 Detailed below is a summary of the consultation responses received. The full version of each consultation response can be viewed on the Council’s website via public access at the following link: www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning

PUBLICITY:

4.2 This application has been advertised by way of individual neighbour notification letters and public site notice which has been displayed nearby.

No written responses have been received.

4.3 HIGHWAYS:

No objections.

5.0 POLICY CONTEXT

National Planning Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

5.1 The NPPF was published on 27th March 2012. Paragraph 13 of the Framework sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 196 of the Framework confirms the tests in s.38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase

Act 2004 and s.70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and that the Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions. Paragraph 197 states that in assessing and determining development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

5.2 The following headings and content of the NPPF are relevant to the consideration of the current proposals:

7. Requiring good design
9. Protecting Green Belt land

Planning Practice Guidance

5.3 In March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) launched its planning practice guidance web-based resource. This was accompanied by a Written Ministerial Statement which includes a list of the previous planning policy guidance documents cancelled when the NPPF was launched. PPG contains 42 subject areas, with each area containing several subtopics. Those of particular relevance to the determination of this planning application comprise:

- Design

Local Planning Policy

Thurrock Local Development Framework (as amended 2015)

5.4 The Council adopted the “Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development Plan Document” in December 2011. The following Core Strategy policies apply to the proposals:

Thematic Policies:

- CSTP22 (Thurrock Design)
- CSTP23 (Thurrock Character and Distinctiveness)²

Policies for the Management of Development:

- PMD1 (Minimising Pollution and Impacts on Amenity)²
- PMD2 (Design and Layout)²
- PMD6 (Development in the Green Belt)²

- PMD8 (Parking Standards)³

[Footnote: ¹New Policy inserted by the Focused Review of the LDF Core Strategy. ²Wording of LDF-CS Policy and forward amended either in part or in full by the Focused Review of the LDF Core Strategy. ³Wording of forward to LDF-CS Policy amended either in part or in full by the Focused Review of the LDF Core Strategy].

Focused Review of the LDF Core Strategy (2014)

- 5.5 This Review was commenced in late 2012 with the purpose to ensure that the Core Strategy and the process by which it was arrived at are not fundamentally at odds with the NPPF. There are instances where policies and supporting text are recommended for revision to ensure consistency with the NPPF. The Review was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for independent examination in August 2013. An Examination in Public took place in April 2014. The Inspector concluded that the amendments were sound subject to recommended changes. The Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development Focused Review: Consistency with National Planning Policy Framework Focused Review was adopted by Council on the 28th February 2015.

Thurrock Core Strategy Position Statement and Approval for the Preparation of a New Local Plan for Thurrock

- 5.6 The above report was considered at the February meeting 2014 of the Cabinet. The report highlighted issues arising from growth targets, contextual changes, impacts of recent economic change on the delivery of new housing to meet the Borough's Housing Needs and ensuring consistency with Government Policy. The report questioned the ability of the Core Strategy Focused Review and the Core Strategy 'Broad Locations & Strategic Sites' to ensure that the Core Strategy is up-to-date and consistent with Government Policy and recommended the 'parking' of these processes in favour of a more wholesale review. Members resolved that the Council undertake a full review of Core Strategy and prepare a new Local Plan.

6.0 ASSESSMENT

BACKGROUND

- 6.1 This application is almost identical to one which was previously refused and dismissed at appeal [reference 16/00992/FUL]. The only difference between this application and application 16/00992/FUL is that the single storey front extension is now proposed to have a flat roof with a lantern and not a pitched roof as was sought previously. The Planning Inspector who dismissed the previous application at appeal stated in his report, 'the proposal is contrary to the development plan

taken as a whole and would not be sustainable development for which the Framework (NPPF) carries a presumption in favour’.

6.2 The assessment below covers the following areas:

- I. Principle of the Development within the Green Belt
- II. Impact on Neighbour Amenity
- III. Design

I. PRINCIPLE OF THE DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE GREEN BELT

6.3 Policy PMD6 sets out that the Council will maintain, protect and enhance the open character of the Green Belt in Thurrock, and that in the Green Belt extensions to dwellings must not represent disproportionate additions to the original property. The Council expects extensions in such locations to be limited to a fixed maximum size, this being the floor area represented by ‘two reasonably sized rooms’ (calculated from the dwelling as originally constructed).

6.4 The original house was approved under planning reference 02/1230/FUL and the two reasonably-sized room allowance of the original property has been calculated as being 21.2 sqm. Since originally constructed, a garage has been added to the property which added 21.9 sqm, essentially taking up the allowance. The extension and dormer window now proposed would take the dwelling in its extended form beyond the two room allowance. The proposed development seeks to convert and extend the garage, resulting in some 16.5m sqm of newly created floorspace. This would be in excess of the policy allowance and it is a straight forward matter to conclude that the development is to Policy PMD6 and the NPPF. The extension therefore constitutes inappropriate development which is by definition, harmful to the Green Belt.

6.5 Having established that the proposal is inappropriate development it is necessary to consider the matter of other harm. In this case, the increase in bulk and scale would cause additional harm to the openness of the Green Belt contrary to PMD6 and the guidance within the NPPF.

6.6 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The NPPF also states:

"When considering any planning application, Local Planning Authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. Very Special Circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason

of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations”

- 6.7 No ‘Very Special Circumstances’ have been provided by the applicant to justify the development within the Green Belt.
- 6.8 In conclusion under this heading, the proposed development constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt and there are no very special circumstances that would clearly outweigh the harm that would be caused.

II. IMPACT ON NEIGHBOUR AMENITY

- 6.9 Policies PMD1 and PMD2 of the Adopted Core Strategy require that all proposals should contribute positively to the amenity and character of the area in which they are located.
- 6.10 By reason of its location, the proposed annexe would have minimal impact on the adjacent properties. If the application was being considered favourably, it would be appropriate to include a condition to ensure use of the annexe would be incidental to the host property minimising risk of future amenity impacts. However, this would not overcome the fundamental objections raised above.

III. DESIGN

- 6.11 No objection is raised in relation to the design and appearance of the proposed front dormer window however concern is raised to the proposed flat roof design which would appear as an incongruous addition to the property, out of character with both the host dwelling and street scene generally. The design would therefore be contrary to Policies PMD2 and CSTP22.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS AND REASON(S) FOR REFUSAL

- 7.1 Notwithstanding the amendments to the scheme following the refusal of 16/00992/FUL, the proposed development constitutes inappropriate development which is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. There are no very special circumstances that would clearly outweigh the harm that would be caused. The design of the proposed extension is also considered out of character with the locality and thereby contrary to PMD2 and the NPPF.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

- 8.1 To Refuse for the following reasons:

Reason(s):

- 1 The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt as defined in the Thurrock

Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (as amended 2015).

Policy PMD6 of the Core Strategy states that in the Green Belt extensions to dwellings must not represent disproportionate additions to the original property. Extensions to existing dwellings in the Green Belt will be strictly controlled and extensions should be limited to a fixed maximum size, this being the floor area represented by two reasonably sized rooms (calculated from the dwelling as originally constructed), including what is permitted by the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Orders. An extension must be of a scale, size, siting, and design and of materials of construction, that the appearance of the original dwelling, the immediate locality and the countryside in general, is not adversely affected.

The National Planning Policy Framework Indicates that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

The proposed development exceeds the policy allowance summarised above and therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is by definition harmful. Furthermore, the development, by reason of increasing the bulk and scale of built development at the property, would cause additional harm to the openness of the Green Belt contrary to PMD6 and the guidance within the NPPF. No very special circumstances have been advanced that would clearly outweigh the harm caused to the Metropolitan Green Belt as a result of the development.

2. Policy PMD2 of the Adopted Core Strategy (as amended in 2015) requires that all proposals should contribute positively to the amenity and character of the area in which they are located.

The proposed single storey front extension would, due to the design of the roof, appear as an incongruous feature to both the host dwelling and the streetscene generally, contrary to Policy PMD2 of the Core Strategy and the specific advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Documents:

All background documents including application forms, drawings and other supporting documentation relating to this application can be viewed online: www.thurrock.gov.uk/planning

