

Plan: B DC/04/00570/FUL Whalebone Ward (R)

Address: 59 Grosvenor Road, Dagenham

Development: Erection of two storey side/rear extension in connection with the conversion of existing dwelling into 2 one bedroom flats and 2 two bedroom flats

Applicant: Rev. Paul Addison

### **Introduction and Description of Development**

The application property is an end of terrace house facing east onto Grosvenor Road. The property also overlooks the junction of Gray Avenue and Grosvenor Road. The property has an existing two storey side extension and has two existing garages in the rear garden. This application relates to a further two storey side/rear extension and the subsequent conversion into two, 2 bedroom flats and 2, one bedroom flats. Two of the bedrooms for the two bedroom flats will occupy the space in the converted roof. The plans show that the roof to the rear extension will be flat and that side extension also incorporates a hip to gable conversion which enables it to be converted into bedroom space. The plans also show two separate rear gardens for the two ground floor flats, the existing garages used for car parking along with a further space in the rear garden, and an existing space in the front garden. The parking spaces in the rear garden are accessed from a rear access road off Gray Avenue.

### **Background**

The existing two storey side extension was granted permission in 1989 (89/00636/TP). The property is also being investigated by Housing Standards as they allege that the property is currently being used as house in multiple occupation. The current status of this Housing Standards investigation is that it has been suspended until a decision has been made on this planning application.

### **Consultations**

#### a) Adjoining occupiers

Three letters of objections were received, however one was signed by 5 separate occupiers along Grosvenor Road. The objectors raised the following issues:

- Restrict views and light to several properties surrounding the application site
- Concerns that this would create a precedent for this type of development
- Concerns about who would control the new tenants
- The proposal would increase congestion and cause a parking problem in the surrounding roads
- Lack of community spirit
- The large extension would be unsightly
- Negative impact on the value of their homes

b) Traffic and Road Safety

The parking space shown in the front garden does not have an approved vehicular crossing, and no crossing will be approved within 10m of a junction.

**UDP Policy**

H10 Conversions  
H13 New Residential Development  
H14 Environmental Requirements  
H15 Residential Amenity  
H16 Internal Design  
H22 and appendix 7 Extensions and Alterations  
Interim Parking Standards- January 2002

Policy issue- The proposal fails to provide an adequate amount of both habitable floor space and private garden space. The proposal includes a flat roof over a two storey rear extension and also incorporates a hip to gable conversion, both of which are contrary to H22.

**Analysis**

An application of this type should be considered in line with policies H10, H13-H16 and H22 and Appendix 7 of the Unitary Development Plan. The proposal does not provide an adequate level of habitable floor space for any of the proposed flats. Policy H16 requires a minimum of 28.5m<sup>2</sup> of habitable floor space per one bedroom flat and both ground floor flats fail to provide this, as they only provide 22m<sup>2</sup> and 25m<sup>2</sup> respectively. With regards to the two bedroom flats, H16 requires that they should provide a minimum of 40m<sup>2</sup> of habitable floor space. Again both flats fail to provide this as they have floor areas of 30m<sup>2</sup> and 35m<sup>2</sup>. The floor area in the loft bedrooms with head room of 1.5m or over was included as part of the habitable floor space calculation for these flats. In terms of policy H15, this states that each one bedroom flat should have access to at least 20m<sup>2</sup> of private garden space, and in this case both of the one bedroom flats on the ground floor have access to gardens in excess of 20m<sup>2</sup>. However in the case of the two, 2 bedroom flats the plans do not show any access to the private garden space and therefore the proposal is contrary to this policy.

The design of the proposal is out of character with the other properties in this area, as the hip style roof has been replaced by a gable ended roof. The poor roof design of the rear extension along with this gable roof would create an over-dominant feature in this junction location. Both of these features are contrary to policy H22 and appendix 7.

In terms of the car parking spaces provided, taking into consideration the comments received from the Traffic and Road Safety Section, the space shown on the plans in the front garden cannot be used. Therefore the proposal has three usable spaces, all to the rear, which is considered to be acceptable in this location which is within walking distance of a number of bus routes.

This property is a large 5 bedroom dwelling with two bathrooms, two reception rooms and a large kitchen/diner. Properties of this type are in high demand in the Borough

and it is felt that its conversion would involve the loss of a type of dwelling that many local families would aspire to own.

In terms of the objections received from the adjoining neighbours, the traffic congestion and car parking problems suffered along Gray Avenue cannot just be attributed to the application property. It is likely that as this property is located close to a shopping parade, other businesses and flats, the parking problem is intensified by these uses more than just 59 Grosvenor Road alone. With regard to the loss of view and light to surrounding properties it is felt that this further extension would not have a detrimental impact on the surrounding properties. In terms of the type of tenants housed in the property and whether they fit into the community, this would not be an issue considered by planning, as who lives in this house cannot be controlled by planning legislation. In terms of the appearance of the extension, as mentioned above the design of the flat roof of the rear extension and the hip to gable conversion is contrary to policy H22 and appendix 7 as it constitutes poor design and is out of character with the host terrace and the area in general. With regards to the loss of value to the surrounding properties, this issue is not a material consideration and therefore permission could not be refused on this issue along.

To conclude the proposal is contrary to policies H15 and H16 as it fails to provide both an adequate amount of habitable floor space and private garden space. It is also contrary to policy H22 and appendix 7 as the proposed extension has a gable ended roof which is out of character with the type of roofs found in this area of the Borough, and that the two storey rear extension has a flat roof.

### **Recommendation**

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal fails to provide adequate private amenity space for the two, 2 bedroom flats and is therefore contrary to policy H15 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proposal fails to provide an adequate amount of habitable floor space for any of the proposed flats and is therefore contrary to policy H16 of the Unitary Development Plan.
3. The flat roofed design of the rear extension and the gable ended design of the side extension are unsympathetic in form to the character of the existing dwelling and the side extension would be an over-dominant feature at this road junction contrary to the visual amenities of the area.
4. The front car parking space is located too close to the junction of Grosvenor Road and Gray Avenue and would result in traffic movements detrimental to highway safety.

Note: If Members agree the recommendation Members are advised that enforcement action will be taken to investigate the use of these premises as a house in multiple occupation.