

## **OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY**

**APPLICATION NO:** P0375.22

**WARD :** Romford Town

**Date Received:** 7th March 2022

**ADDRESS:** 115 Lodge Avenue  
Romford

**PROPOSAL:** Single storey side and rear extension following demolition of existing side and rear extension.

**DRAWING NO(S):** T(20) 100 (Revision: P01)  
T(20) 101 (Revision: P01)  
T(20) 201 (Revision: P01)  
T(90) 100 (Revision: P03)  
T(20) 200 (Revision: P02)

**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 two storey semi-detached residential dwellinghouse. It currently benefits from a small rear extension. It is not a listed building, nor is located in a conservation area.

### **DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL**

Planning permission is sought for a single storey side and rear extension.

### **RELEVANT HISTORY**

- D0129.22 - Certificate of Lawfulness for conversion of roof space of habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 No. front roof lights, and conversion of roof from hip to gable end to include new gable end window  
Awaiting Decision
- P2400.21 - Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion.  
Refuse 18-02-2022

### **CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS**

Letters of notification were sent to three neighbours regarding the application. No comments/objections 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 proposal is not CIL liable because the new floorspace created is less than 100 square metres.

### **STAFF COMMENTS**

In accordance with the current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not undertaken. Site photos provided by the agent in support of this 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**

The side element of the proposal would be set back from the front of the host dwelling by 0.235m, whilst the rear element of the proposal would project beyond the rear of the subject property by 4m.

The proposal is considered to relate acceptably to the host property in terms of its bulk, scale and mass however. No objections are therefore raised from a visual standpoint.

### **IMPACT ON AMENITY**

Regarding the impact of the side element of the proposal on the host dwelling's attached neighbours no. 113 Lodge Avenue, this element of the proposals would be located on the host dwelling's north side. As the attached neighbours are located to the opposite side of the subject property, well away from this element of the proposals, it is not envisaged that it would have any impact on the amenity of this neighbour.

As for its impact on no. 117 Lodge Avenue, the development would be situated up against the boundary of these unattached neighbours. No flank windows are proposed meaning that no loss of privacy would occur. Site inspection also reveals that this neighbour does not benefit from flank windows which face the subject property. As a result, it is not envisaged that the side element of the proposals would impact the amenity of no. 117.

All other neighbouring properties are deemed to be sufficiently removed from the two storey side extension to have any impact from a neighbourliness point of view.

In terms of the impact of the rear element of the proposal on no. 113 Lodge Avenue, it would project 4m along the common boundary with this neighbour, in line with guidance set out in the SPD which advises that as a general rule, houses can be extended from the rear wall of the original dwelling by up to 4 metres in depth for a semi-detached dwellings. As such, it is considered that any impact of the proposal's depth on the host dwelling's attached neighbour is considered to be within acceptable realms. Although the height of this element of the proposal,

at approximately 3.20m, would be marginally in excess of guidelines set out in the SPD, it is not considered that the height of the rear extension would be detrimental to the amenity of these neighbouring occupants.

The rear extension would project approximately 1.4m along the shared boundary with no. 117 Lodge Avenue. The depth of the proposal beyond this point would be set in from the common boundary with this neighbour by about 2.62m. Staff note that this neighbour benefits from a rear extension. Although the overall depth of the proposal would project beyond this neighbour's extension, the projection would be about 1.20m, less than the 4m usually permissible if a semi-detached neighbour has not extended. The extension to no. 117, in conjunction with the degree of inset of the extension from the shared boundary are both considered to mitigate the impacts of the rear extension on this unattached neighbour.

All other neighbouring properties are deemed to be sufficiently removed from the rear extension to have any impact from a neighbourliness point of view.

While no balcony has been proposed on the flat roof of the proposal, it is considered prudent to impose a condition restricting it from being utilized as a terrace or similar amenity space in order to prevent any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. Also, to ensure that the extension would not result in a loss of privacy to or damage the environment of neighbouring occupants, staff consider it prudent to impose a condition which prevents windows or other openings being formed in the flank walls of this proposed development unless permission is sought and obtained from the Council first.

## **HIGHWAY/PARKING**

No highway or parking issues would arise from the proposed development.

## **KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS**

The proposals are not judged to adversely affect the character of the property or the overall visual appearance of the street or rear garden scene. Additionally, they would not cause a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities enjoyed by neighbouring properties. It is therefore recommended that planning permission is 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. SC10C Materials as per application form**

The proposed development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the materials detailed under the materials section of the application form unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise

with the character of the surrounding 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.

**5. SC48 (Balcony condition)**

The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In the interests of the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwelling.

---

**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.

---

|                                        |
|----------------------------------------|
| <b>Authorising Officer:</b> Neil Goate |
|----------------------------------------|

|            |
|------------|
| 27-05-2022 |
|------------|