

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0056.20

WARD : Romford Town

Date Received: 17th January 2020

ADDRESS: 44 DOUGLAS ROAD
HORNCHURCH

PROPOSAL: Part single storey, part two storey rear extension.

DRAWING NO(S): Block / Site Plan
A101
A102
A103
A104
A105
A106

RECOMMENDATION : It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the reason(s) given at the end of the report

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site features a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a brick face finish and a gabled, tiled roof.

There is space along the side for on-site parking for 1 vehicle. The site has benefitted from a single storey rear extension of approximately 2.3m depth. The attached neighbour does not have any extensions.

The application site is located within a residential area. The site is not within a conservation area nor is it a listed building.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The scheme proposes a part single storey, part two storey rear extension.

The single storey rear extension proposes a depth of 5m built to boundary with the attached neighbour with a flat roof and maximum height of 3m for a kitchen/ reception area.

The first floor extension proposes a depth of 3m and setback of 1m from the common boundary with the attached neighbour, for the creation of an additional bedroom. The two storey element proposes a hipped roof (to match existing) with an overall height of 6.8m, going down to 5.6m at the eaves.

Overall the proposed extensions will create approximately 37 square metres of additional space.

RELEVANT HISTORY

None.

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Surrounding occupiers were notified and one objection was received and has been summarised by officers as follows:

- No upper storey extension should be built which would affect the attached neighbours right to light, particularly in the bathroom, or that breaches the 45 degree rule.
- Agreement to a party wall agreement if deemed necessary by our surveyors and all notice periods met.
- Due to the parking restraints in the road, access to our property needs to remain clear at all times.

It is noted that any issues during construction such as parking / access is not a planning issue and therefore cannot be commented on during this process. A Party Wall agreement is a civil matter between neighbours and does not form part of the planning remit, therefore hasn't been addressed in this report.

All other issues are addressed in the report below.

Internal consultation responses include:

- Environmental Health: If the application is approved through the appeal process, a gas membrane condition should be included as the site is within the 250m Landfill buffer zone. As follows:

Prior to the commencement of any groundworks or development of the site, details shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority setting out suitable gas protection measures to be employed on site including, but not necessarily limited to, the installation of a suitable gas resistant membrane. The gas protection measures shall be carried out in strict accordance with the agreed details. Upon completion of installation, a 'Verification Report' must be submitted demonstrating that the works have been carried out.

Reason: Insufficient information has been submitted to ensure that the occupants of the development and property are not subject to any risks from soil gas and/or vapour in accordance with LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD Policy DC53.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

DC33 - Car Parking
 DC61 - Urban Design
 SPD04 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

OTHER

LONDON PLAN - 7.4 - Local character
 LONDON PLAN - 7.6 - Architecture
 NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Policy DC61 states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area.

The proposal is located at the rear and would have little to no impact on the streetscene.

It is noted that the attached neighbour does not have any extensions, whereas the non-attached neighbour has a single storey and two storey rear extension.

Havering's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2011 recommends that single storey rear extensions for semi-detached dwellings should be no more than 4m deep and 3m high with a flat

roof.

The proposal includes the demolition of the existing 2.3m deep rear extension and replacement with a 5m deep rear extension built to boundary with a flat roof. The proposal goes beyond the SPD's recommendations by 1m depth but is compliant in the height.

The SPD states that first floor rear extensions for semi-detached properties can have a depth of 3m if they are setback by a minimum of 2m from the common boundary with the attached neighbour to ensure amenity impacts are protected.

The proposal includes a first floor element with a depth of 3m but only setback by 1m from the attached neighbour, contrary to the SPD. The extension proposes a hipped roof to match the existing roof. Brick face is proposed for the walls and similar style windows to match existing.

Although the non-attached neighbour has a single storey and two storey rear extension, it appears that it has been designed generally in accordance with the SPD, with both sides of the semi-detached dwelling developing an adjoining two storey element together. It cannot be compared to the proposed development in this case.

Overall the proposal would introduce an incongruous and excessively bulky extension to the rear of the property which would appear as a dominant and visually intrusive feature detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property, pair of semis and visual amenity of the surrounding area, which is contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2011 and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Consideration has been given to the attached neighbour at no.42 Douglas Road and the non-attached neighbour at no. 46 Douglas Road.

The proposed extension is setback from the non-attached neighbour by approximately 2.8m. The proposed first floor element does not have any side windows and any overshadowing would predominantly be over the roof of the neighbour's single storey rear extension. Therefore it is considered that there wouldn't be any undue or significant amenity impacts to the non-attached neighbour at no. 46 Douglas Road.

The proposed single storey rear extension with a depth of 5m along the common boundary with no.42 Douglas Road would have a significant adverse impact to the adjoining neighbour. As they don't have any extensions, the introduction of a 5m wall on their boundary would result in a significant loss of outlook and an increased sense of enclosure to the detriment of the occupiers. This would be further worsened by the first floor element above, which only proposes a 1m setback (instead of a minimum of 2m setback as recommended in the SPD) which would have an overbearing impact to the detriment of the amenity enjoyed by the adjoining neighbour. Overall the proposed development would result in adverse impacts regarding overshadowing, loss of access to light, loss of outlook and an increased sense of enclosure for the attached neighbour at no. 42.

Consequently, the proposal is contrary to policy and would unacceptably impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbour at no. 42 Douglas Road and is deemed to be unneighbourly.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

No highway or parking issues would arise as a result of the proposal. There is one parking space available at the front/ side of the property, which won't be affected by the proposal.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposed development would, by reason of its bulk, size and siting, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the garden scene and have significant amenity impacts to the neighbour at no.42 Douglas Road, which is contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2011 and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission be refused.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the following reason(s):

1. Reason for refusal - Residential extensions

The proposed rear extensions would, by reason of their excessive depth, bulk and position close to the boundaries of the site, form a dominant and intrusive feature detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and visual amenity of the locality, as well as having an overbearing impact and resulting in a significant loss of outlook, light and an increased sense of enclosure to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of no.42 Douglas Road contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2011.

1 Refusal - No negotiation

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal and the reason(s) for it was given to ManageSolutions Ltd, via email on 28 April 2020.

Authorising Officer: Neil Goate	28-04-2020
--	------------