

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0427.21

WARD : Elm Park

Date Received: 8th March 2021

ADDRESS: 36 Windermere Avenue
Hornchurch

PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension

DRAWING NO(S): Site Location Plan; DMP50021Rev; DMP50022Rev.

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

SITE DESCRIPTION

Site comprises of an end of terrace two storey dwelling.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension.

RELEVANT HISTORY

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

No representations were received as part of neighbour notification process.

RELEVANT POLICIES

London Plan Policies (Adopted March 2021)

D1 (London's form, character and capacity for growth)

D4 (Delivering good design).

LDF

DC33 - Car Parking

DC61 - Urban Design

SPD04 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

OTHER

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

There are no CIL contributions required due to the limited floor area created.

STAFF COMMENTS

It should be noted that no pre-application advice was sought prior to the submission of the application and it is considered that the changes required to try and bring the proposal within the realms of acceptability would be minor. The case officer raised concerns in an e-mail to the agent on the 29 April. Changes and extension of time were requested, but no revised drawings were received.

Due to the current Covid-19 crisis, the officer was unable to do a site visit. Site photos were sent in by the agent. Aerial views, streetview and photos were used also to assess the site and the proposal.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

As a general rule, the SPD states that houses can be extended from the rear wall of the original dwelling by up to 3 metres in depth for a terrace house and up to 4 metres in depth for a semi-detached or detached dwelling. This is to ensure the extension is subordinate to the original dwelling and not harmful to neighbouring amenity.

The proposed extension would be 3.7metres in depth from the rear wall and therefore not policy compliant.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Consideration has been given to the impact on the neighbouring dwelling in terms of loss of light and loss of privacy.

Guidelines indicate that terraced houses can normally be extended from the rear wall of the original dwelling by up to 3m and that they should generally be no more than 3m in height for a single storey extension with a flat roof. This is to ensure there is no unreasonable loss of amenity to neighbouring properties or reduction in sunlight or daylight.

Guidelines go on to suggest that if a greater depth is required it should be within an angle of 45 degrees, taken from the 3m dimension on the property boundary. At a depth of 3.7m the extension does not meet these guidelines and therefore would have an impact

The proposal would be sufficiently set in from the boundary from the detached neighbour at no.38 Windermere Avenue so not to impact on their amenity and privacy and this is due to the separation distance from the boundary and position of the boundary treatment.

No. 34 Windermere Avenue would be the property most affected by the proposal. It is noted that there is no extensions to the rear of their property to mitigate the proposal. It is considered the depth and height of the proposal would unacceptably overbear and dominate the outlook and amenity of this neighbour.

It is considered that the single storey rear extension will give rise to a significant light loss and provide a "wall of development" which will give rise to an uncomfortable overbearing effect and sense of enclosure harmful to their amenity.

The proposal is deemed unneighbourly and therefore fails to comply with guidance set out in the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is considered to be contrary to the above-mentioned policies and guidance and a refusal is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION

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

1. Reason for refusal - Residential Extensions

The proposed single storey rear extension would, by reason of its excessive depth and position close to the boundary of the site, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Plan Document.

1 Refusal - Amendments requested not made

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, improvements required to make the proposal acceptable were negotiated with David Peacock (agent) by e-mail on the 29 April 2021 which involved reducing the depth. No revised plans were received.

Authorising Officer: Habib Neshat

05-05-2021