

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0603.22

WARD : Hyl/Hy; & Harr Lodge

Date Received: 12th April 2022

ADDRESS: 103 Chestnut Avenue
Hornchurch

PROPOSAL: Single storey front extension, part single, part two storey storey side extension and single storey rear extension

DRAWING NO(S): 9159.001
9159.004

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

SITE DESCRIPTION

Residential, two storey semi-detached dwelling finished in painted render. Parking on the drive to the front of the property. The surrounding area is characterised by bungalows, two storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a single storey front extension and part single, part two storey side and single storey rear extension.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P2201.21 - Single storey rear and side extension and double storey front extension.
Withdrawn 11-01-2022

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

No representations were received as part of the planning process.

RELEVANT POLICIES

- For ease of reference, the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD will be referred as "SPD".

LONDON PLAN:

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). Havering Local Plan has now been adopted and Policies 7 (Residential design and amenity), 24 (Parking provision and design), 26 (Urban Design) of the Havering Local Plan (2016-2031) are relevant.

LDF

SPD04 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

OTHER

OTHER

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

This application is not CIL liable because the newly created floor space does not exceed 100 square metres.

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 agent in support of the application. In determining this planning application photos, Google StreetView TM, aerial view images and submitted drawings were used to assess the site constraints.

This application is a re-submission of a previously withdrawn application P2201.21. The application was withdrawn following concerns regarding the design of the proposal in particular the two storey front/side extension.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD states that unless larger extensions already exist in the immediate locality or unless special circumstances make it acceptable, front additions should not normally project more than 1m from the front main wall of a dwelling. Forward extensions of upper floors may be acceptable if an unobtrusive and subservient appearance can be achieved.

In this case, the single storey front extension would be 1.125m deep and be finished with a mono-pitched roof. It is noted that the depth of the front extension is marginally deeper than guidelines. However, it is noted that this part of the proposal would be no deeper than the front extension at No.105 Chestnut Avenue as shown on the submitted drawings.

Inspection of the site and surroundings reveals that there are numerous front extensions and porches nearby of various styles and designs. In this context, it is considered that the proposed single storey front extension would not look out of character with the immediate vicinity and furthermore, it will replace an existing canopy porch.

The proposed single storey front extension would be acceptably designed and in all, would not unduly impact upon the street scene.

The proposed two storey side extension would align with the front wall of the dwelling house and would not extend the full depth of the dwelling, resulting in a lower ridge line than the main dwelling house and as such, providing a subservient appearance.

It is noted that No.105 Chestnut Avenue has benefited from a two storey side extension, however, this property forms part of a new terraced group, as an additional dwelling (No.107a) was added to the side of No.107 which was approved in 2008. The two storey side extension which was added to No.105 was granted consent in 2012 under planning reference P0160.12.

Mindful of the limited width of the two storey side extension and the lower ridge line but also that the side access would be retained to the side of the dwelling, no objections are raised to the proposed two storey side extension.

The proposed ground floor side to the rear of the two storey side extension and the single storey rear extension would be screened from the street by the proposed single storey front and first floor side extension and the detached neighbour and therefore it is considered that it would not

impact on the street scene.

The proposed first floor side and single storey rear extension would be visible from the rear garden environment.

It is considered that the roof design of the first floor side extension would not unacceptably impact on the rear garden environment as it would be screened in part by the detached property.

It is considered the proposal would not unduly impact on the street and rear garden environment. The proposal would be of an acceptable design and will relate well with the existing dwelling in terms of bulk, scale and massing.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

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

The single storey front extension would be set off the boundary with No.101 by approximately 4m.

The single/two storey side extension would be located on the east side of the dwelling. It is not envisaged that this part of the proposal would have any impact on the amenity of the attached neighbour at No.101 Chestnut Avenue as they are located to the west and the separation distance would mitigate any potential impact as the proposal would be located on the opposite side of the dwelling.

Furthermore, at a depth of 3m, the proposed ground floor rear extension would be less than the 4m normally permissible under guidance for a semi-detached property. The roof of the single storey rear extension would have an overall height of approximately 3.65m and a low eaves line of 2.55m. Only a small proportion of the roof would be above the 3m height permissible under normal guidelines. It is considered that the height of the roof would not unacceptably impact on the amenity of the attached neighbour at No.101 Chestnut Avenue.

In addition, no loss of sunlight would arise from the single storey extension as the sun travels around the front of the dwelling during the day.

As a result, it is considered that the proposed development would not unacceptably impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbours at No.101 Chestnut Avenue.

The detached neighbour lies to the east of the application site and has a ground floor front and rear extension.

The ground floor front extension would be mitigated by the neighbour ground floor front at No.105.

An equivalent degree of amenity should be secured for the neighbouring dwelling on the non-attached boundary both in terms of the existing house and rear garden and in terms of the ability to build an extension in line with this SPD.

The two storey side extension would not project beyond the front or rear elevation of No.105. The proposed two storey side extension would be mitigated by the extended neighbouring dwelling at No.105 and it is considered that this part of the proposal would not unacceptably impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbours.

The proposed ground floor side extension would replace an existing structure with the roof hipped away from this neighbour and for these reasons, it is considered that the side extension would not unacceptably impact on the detached neighbour at No.105.

The 3m deep ground floor rear extension would be less than Council guidelines. The pitched roof would be hipped away from No.105 to minimise the impact from this part of the proposal on this neighbour. It is noted that No.105 is an end terraced property with a rear extension which is approximately 3m deep and their neighbouring rear extension would partly mitigate the proposed ground floor rear extension.

Given these circumstances and mindful of the general presumption in favour of development, it is considered any impact upon the adjacent neighbours to be modest and within that envisaged as acceptable within guidelines.

To safeguard the privacy of the adjoining neighbours, should the application be approved a condition will need to be imposed to ensure that no openings will be added to side of the proposed extensions, unless specific permission is obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

Although, the proposal would project forward of the dwelling at the front, the proposal would still be able to retain on-site parking. No highway or parking issues would arise from the proposal.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the above-mentioned policies and guidance and approval is recommended.

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. SC45 (Standard Porch Condition)

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, no porches shall be erected to the front or side of the extension hereby permitted, without the express permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In the interests of amenity and to enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over future development.

5. 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 Party Wall

Party Wall Informative

This planning permission does not remove the need to obtain any separate consent of the owner of the adjoining property prior to commencing building works on, under, above or immediately adjacent to their property (e.g. foundations or guttering). The Party Wall Etc. Act 1996 contains requirements to serve notice on adjoining owners of property under certain circumstances, and a procedure exists for resolving disputes. This is a matter of civil law between the two parties, and the Local Planning Authority are not involved in such matters.

A free guide called "The Party Wall Etc Act 1996: Explanatory Booklet" is available on the website of the Department for Communities and Local Government.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-party-wall-etc-act-1996-revised-explanatory-booklet>

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

07-06-2022