

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P1311.21

WARD : Havering Park

Date Received: 2nd July 2021

ADDRESS: 60 BELLE VUE ROAD
COLLIER ROW
ROMFORD

PROPOSAL: Demolition of the existing rear / side extension, and the erection of a rear / side extension.

DRAWING NO(S): Site Location Plan
01/DT/06/2021 - Sheet 1
04/DT/06/2021 - Sheet 4
03/DT/06/2021 - Sheet 3
02/DT/06/2021 - Sheet 2

RECOMMENDATION : It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site lies on the eastern side of Belle Vue Road, and contains a two storey mid-terrace building originally in use (and remains) as a single family dwellinghouse.

The site lies in an Archaeological Priority Zone (APZ), but does not contain or affect the setting of any other heritage assets. The site is subject to the borough-wide Article 4 Direction for a change of use to a HMO, although this is not relevant to this application. The site does not have any policy allocations or limitations.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing extension at the rear of the site, and the erection of a new rear extension. The proposed extension would be similar in terms of footprint to the existing extension, although it would be slightly higher. The existing extension has an eaves height of 2.2m, and a maximum height of 2.6m. These measurements do not include an original single storey rear projection, which has a maximum height of approximately 3.5m. The proposed extension has an eaves height of 2.5m, and a maximum height of 3.5m.

RELEVANT HISTORY

L/HAV/334/77 - Demolish existing garage & rebuild larger one. - approved 29th April 2021.

D0462.21 - Certificate of lawfulness for the conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer with 2 front roof lights
Awaiting Decision

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Following from public and statutory consultation, no objections were received by the Council.

RELEVANT POLICIES

The Development Plan is made up of the National Planning Policy Framework July 2021 (NPPF), the London Plan March 2021 (LP), and the Havering Core Strategy 2008 (HCS).

Whilst an assessment is made against the Development Plan as a whole, the most relevant policies are set out below:

National Planning Policy Framework July 2021

- Chapter 12 - Achieving Well Designed Places
- Chapter 16 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

London Plan March 2021

- Policy D1 - London's form, character and capacity for growth
- Policy D3 - Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
- Policy D4 - Delivering Good Design
- Policy HC1 - Heritage Conservation and Growth

Havering Core Strategy Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008.

- CP17 - Design
- DC59 - Biodiversity in New Developments
- DC61 - Urban Design
- DC70 - Archaeology and Ancient Monuments
- SPD4 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

Further to this, the new Havering Local Plan (2016-2030) has been submitted for consideration with the Secretary of State. Whilst this document has not been formally adopted, it is anticipated that this document and the policies will be formally adopted in the near future. The relevant policies at the time of writing are set out below:

- Policy 26 - Urban Design
- Policy 27 - Landscaping
- Policy 28 - Heritage Assets

Other Documents

- BRE guidance on daylight, sunlight and outlook -"Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight - A guide to good practice [second edition]" by Paul Littlefair.

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed increase in floor space is less than 100sqm in area, and therefore is exempt from any CIL liability (both Mayoral CIL and Havering CIL).

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The extension of a dwellinghouse is not precluded or otherwise opposed under policies of the Development Plan.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The site lies in an area where there is some degree of consistency with the terrace to which the property belongs. The terrace is laid out in mirrored pairs, as demonstrated through the layout and design of the bay windows and entrances to the properties, as well as the original single storey rear projection, presumably originally used as a coal store, outside toilet or larder / pantry for the kitchen. This projection has a mono-pitched roof, and as existing, the subject site has a variety of different roof forms due to the later non-original conservatory addition.

The proposed development would remove the original mono-pitched roof, but would replace this with a single, cohesive design response. The original rear projection was not of any architectural or historic significance, the loss of this is considered acceptable. The existing conservatory also resulted in a variety of roof forms and materials, which resulted in a cluttered rear elevation. The

proposed extension would remove this cluttered extension, and result in a single piece of development, bringing some degree of cohesion to the rear of this property. A similar design response has been seen in other developments in the terrace, and therefore follows this established design response.

The proposed extension is not noticeably larger in footprint than the existing conservatory. Nor is the proposed extension noticeably larger in terms of height. Consequently, the development would maintain the modest degree of extension to the original house found in the existing situation, and this is therefore considered acceptable.

There is an opportunity to improve the biodiversity offering of the site, through design features such as the use of a green roof / brown roof for the extension, and the introduction of bird boxes / insect hotels attached to the external walls. However the proposed extensions would not remove any of the existing garden, and the biodiversity offering of the site would not be negatively impacted by the development. The lack of any improvement measures is also not sufficient to warrant a reason for refusal, noting that the site has a large garden and therefore provides ample biodiversity offering in this area.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The site lies on the eastern side of Belle Vue Road, with No62 situated to the north, and No58 to the south. No58 already has a rear extension, and the proposed extension at the subject site would not be any larger than this. Consequently, the impact on No58 would be acceptable in terms of daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy, the sense of enclosure, and the overbearing nature of the built form.

No62 has not been extended, but has the original single storey rear projection (outrigger) along the boundary with the subject site. The rear door and window to this outrigger would have some degree of impact in terms of daylight and sense of enclosure. However, given that this door / window is overlooked by the existing conservatory, any additional impact would be negligible, and not sufficient for refusing permission. It is for this reason also (the comparison with the existing conservatory) that the proposed extension would be acceptable in terms of the impact on: sunlight, outlook, privacy, the sense of enclosure, and the overbearing nature of the built form.

Overall the impact of the development would be acceptable, noting the modest addition to the built form, and change to the materials when compared to the existing conservatory.

ARCHAEOLOGY

The site lies in an Archaeological Preservation Area (APA), and officers have reviewed the location maps for the area in relation to historic uses, and potential for archaeological artefacts to be found. However, the proposed extension would not be noticeably different in terms of size to the existing extension on the site. Furthermore, any excavation works would be similar (in terms of depth, etc) to the existing situation, and therefore the potential to impact artefacts of heritage interest would be limited. Furthermore, the site lies to the south west of an identified medieval moated manor, which was located in or around Immanuel School (located on Havering Road). This is sufficiently distant from the application site to not cause concerns over the potential impact and / or disturbance to archaeological artefacts of heritage interest.

Overall, the potential for impacting the APZ is low, and the impact on the APZ would be acceptable. There is no need for further information or any requirements for survey / watching brief on any grant of planning permission.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposed development would respect the character and appearance of the area without having any unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with the Development Plan policies and guidance specified above.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. SC32 (Accordance with plans)

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out as approved.

3. SC10 (Matching materials)

Notwithstanding the drawings and details hereby approved, all new external finishes shall be carried out in materials to match those of the existing building(s) to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.

INFORMATIVES

1 Approval - No negotiation required

Statement Required by Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2015: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Authorising Officer: Simon Thelwell

Simon Thelwell

13-08-2021

Authorising Officer:	Simon Thelwell	<i>Simon Thelwell</i>	11-08-2021
Authorising Officer:	Simon Thelwell		13-08-2021
Authorising Officer:	Simon Thelwell		11-08-2021