

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P2340.21

WARD : Squirrels Heath

Date Received: 13th December 2021

ADDRESS: 39 ROWAN WALK
HORNCHURCH

PROPOSAL: PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR ADDITION, GROUND FLOOR
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY TO BE REPLACED
BY SMALL REAR EXTENSION. ALSO INCLUDES A FRONT
DORMER AND FRONT EXTENSION.

DRAWING NO(S): 0011
101
001A
01
04
03
200A
105
100
300
201
202
001
02

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

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site features a detached bungalow situated on a corner site. It currently benefits from a rear conservatory. It is not a listed building, nor is located within a conservation area.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the addition of a first floor, a ground floor rear extension, front dormer and front extension.

1. The dwelling's existing rear conservatory would be demolished.
2. The dwelling would also be extended at the side.

RELEVANT HISTORY

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Letters of notification were sent to eight neighbouring properties regarding this application. No
representations were received.

RELEVANT POLICIES

* For ease of reference, Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD will be referred to as 'SPD'.

LONDON PLAN (adopted 2021):

- Policy D1 - London's form, character and capacity for growth
- Policy D4 - Delivering good design
- Policy T6 - Car parking

Havering Council Local Plan (2016-31):

- Policy 7 (Residential design and amenity)
- Policy 24 (Parking provision and design)
- Policy 26 (Urban Design)

LDF

SPD04 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

OTHER

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The Havering and London Mayoral CIL payment is applicable as the proposal is for an extended dwelling and creates more than 100 square metres of additional floor space. The gross internal floor area of the existing dwelling is 99.75 square metres and this can be deducted from the gross internal floor area of the extended dwelling. The dwelling would have a total of area of 221.41 square metres once extended. The difference equates to 121.66 square metres which is rounded up to 122 square metres.

The Mayoral CIL has a charging rate of £25 per square metre of net additional floor space of the proposed development and therefore the liability equals $122 \times £25 \text{ per sq.m} = £3,050$.

The Havering CIL has been implemented from the 1st September 2019, which has a charging rate of £125 per square metre of net additional floor space of the proposed development in Zone A.

The proposal would be liable for Havering Community Infrastructure Levy contributions of CIL of £15,250 ($£125 \times 122$) to mitigate the impact of the development.

The total CIL levy $£3,050$ (Mayor's CIL) + $£15,250$ (Havering CIL) = $£18,300$.

The total CIL liability to be paid is $£18,300$.

STAFF COMMENTS

In accordance with the current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not undertaken. Site photos were provided by the applicant in support of the application. In determining this planning application, photos, Google Street View, aerial view images and submitted drawings were used to assess the site's constraints.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Roof extensions and alterations can change the appearance and character of dwellings, particularly when alterations are made to the front elevation. When considering the potential impact caused by alterations to form a new first floor, a particularly sensitive approach should be adopted.

The subject dwelling is situated on a corner site along Rowan Walk. The surrounding vicinity is predominantly characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings of 1-2 storeys.

Considering this, the creation of a two storey property is not deemed to out of character with the mixture of dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the application site, and is judged to be in-keeping with the surrounding townscape. The flat roof design of the front of the host dwelling is not judged sufficiently harmful to the street scene owing to the flat roof designs of the nearby properties nos. 66 Haynes Road and 11 Rowan Walk.

Regarding the proposed front extension, this element of the proposals would project approximately 2.30m deep and would not project beyond the main building line of dwellings along Rowan Walk. Given that the host dwelling is set well back from the front of the street, together with the fact that the front extension is judged to integrate well with the host dwelling from a design standpoint, no objections are raised from a visual point-of-view and it is not considered that this element of the proposal would be harmful to the street scene.

With respect to front dormers, the SPD recommends that a dormer window facing the highway should have a width no greater than 1.2m. The width should also not exceed the height (measured vertically between the highest and lowest points at which any part of the dormer intersects with the main roof). Whilst the dimensions of the proposed front dormer would exceed guidelines set out in the SPD, it is noted that there are examples of front dormer in the immediate vicinity of the host dwelling, such as at nos. 27, 29 Rowan Walk and 66 Haynes Road. Also, a few properties further down Rowan Walk benefit from similarly styled front dormers to the development proposed, specifically nos. 5 and 17. Given the range of front dormers of varying sizes and designs in the surrounding area, the proposed dormer is not considered to be visually intrusive or incongruous to the street scene.

The rear extension is considered to relate well to the host dwelling in terms of its bulk, scale and mass. No objections are raised from a visual standpoint.

There are also no objections to the design of the rear roof light or the extension of the dwelling to the side from a visual point-of-view.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

With regards to the impact of the proposed first floor addition on the amenity of no. 87 Haynes Road, it is acknowledged that there is potential for overlooking from the development into the gardens of this neighbour. However, this is not considered to be any significantly greater than overlooking from the first floor windows of the neighbouring property no. 89 Haynes Road which already overlooks no. 87's rear garden area. This, in conjunction with the fact that the both the host dwelling and no. 87 are set in from their common boundary, resulting in a gap of over 6m between the two dwellings, means any impacts of the proposed first floor addition on this neighbour are thus considered to be within reasonable tolerances. All other neighbouring properties are considered to be sufficiently separated from the host dwelling such that they would not suffer any material harm to their amenity from the proposed first floor addition.

The proposed front extension, in terms of its impact on the neighbour no. 37 Rowan Walk, would be situated on the host dwelling's west side. As these neighbours are located to the east, well away from the proposal, it is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to their amenity. All other neighbouring properties are considered to be sufficiently separated from the proposed front extension such that they would not suffer any material harm to their amenity.

The dormer is to the front of the property facing towards the street. It's positioning is such that no material harm to neighbouring residential amenity is considered to occur and overlooking would be to the front over public highway.

The proposed rear extension would be set in from the host dwelling's shared boundary with no. 87 Haynes Road by over 2m. This neighbouring dwelling is set in from the common boundary with the subject property by over 3m. The degree of inset of both the rear extension and no. 87 from the shared boundary is judged to mitigate any impacts of the proposed extension on these neighbouring occupants. All other neighbouring properties are considered to be sufficiently separated from the proposed front extension such that they would not suffer any material harm to their amenity.

The proposed rear roof light and extension of dwelling to the side is not considered to be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring properties.

A condition will be imposed requiring that no window or other opening shall be formed in the flank walls of the proposal unless specific permission has been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority first to ensure that it would not result in any loss of privacy or damage to the environment of neighbouring properties which exist or may be proposed in the future.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

No highways or car parking issues would arise from this proposal.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposals are not considered to harm the character of the surrounding area and are not judged to result in any loss of amenity to neighbouring residents.

In light of this, it is recommended that planning permission is therefore GRANTED.

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. SC10 (Matching materials)

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.

3. 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.

4. SC46 (Standard flank window condition)

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, no window or other opening (other than those shown on the submitted and approved plan,) shall be formed in the flank wall(s) of the building(s) hereby permitted, unless specific permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In order to ensure a satisfactory development that will not result in any loss of privacy or damage to the environment of neighbouring properties which exist or may be proposed in the future.

INFORMATIVES

1 Approval and CIL

The proposal is liable for the Mayor of London Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Based upon the information supplied with the application, the CIL payable would be £18,300 (this figure may go up or down, subject to indexation). CIL is payable within 60 days of commencement of development. A Liability Notice will be sent to the applicant (or anyone else who has assumed liability) shortly and you are required to notify the Council of the commencement of the development before works begin. Further details with regard to CIL are available from the Council's website.

2 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: Neil Goate
--

04-03-2022
