

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P1554.22

WARD : Marshalls & Rise Pk

Date Received: 22nd September 2022

ADDRESS: 24 Glenton Close
Romford

PROPOSAL: Single storey side/rear extension
Revised Plans received 07.10.22

DRAWING NO(S): B (91) 100 Revision P02
T (20) 100 Revision P01
T (90) 100 Revision P02
T (20) 101 Revision P01
T (20) 200 Revision P03
T (20) 201 Revision P01

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 comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a pebble-dash and face brick finish and a tiled roof. The application site is located at the end of a cul-de-sac. There is a detached garage to the side for car parking with shared use of the driveway. There are 3 other smaller sheds in the rear and side garden.

The surrounding properties are characterised by a similar pattern of development, being mostly comprised of two storey semi-detached and terraced houses.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

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

The existing patio will be removed to make way for the proposal and although not mentioned on the application form a new patio is proposed which would be less than 30cm in height.

RELEVANT HISTORY

D0781.21 - Certificate of Lawfulness for use of the land for siting a mobile home for use ancillary to the main dwelling and the proposed mobile home meets the definition of a caravan as set out in the Caravan Sites Act 1968, and as amended in October 2006 (CSA)

Withdrawn 10-03-2022

P2324.21 - Erection of a timber single storey granny annexe for ancillary use to the main dwelling

Apprv with cons 09-03-2022

P1454.21 - Single storey rear extension, two storey side extension, single storey outbuilding to rear for use as an annex

Refuse 22-09-2021

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

One representation was received in response to the neighbour consultation with their comments summarised below:

- Main concern is a potential loss of privacy due to the elevated position of the extension.
- Light pollution from existing high powered security light.

The comments regarding a loss of privacy will be considered under the impact on amenity section of the report. Issues regarding the existing high powered security light do not form part of this application. The matter should be reported to Public Protection team as an anti-social matter, so it can be investigated.

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

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

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The additional floor space would be less than 100 square metre and therefore the proposal would not be CIL liable.

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.

Revised plans were received during the planning process for clarity in respect to steps/patio into the garden. Neighbours were not re-notified as these revisions were sought for clarity.

This application is a resubmission of a previously refused planning application P1454.21. The key issue in this case therefore is whether the revised proposal overcomes the previously stated concerns. The previous applications were refused planning permission for the following reasons.

1. The proposed rear extension would, by reason of its excessive height and position close to the boundaries of the site, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers at no. 23 Glenton Close, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

2. The proposed detached annexe, would by reason of its functional separation from the main dwelling, large size and siting, represent an overdevelopment in the rear garden environment which is inconsistent with the prevailing open character of the rear garden scene and pattern of development, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

3. The proposed detached annexe would be functionally separate from the main house, with its own garden and independent access, resulting in additional comings and goings, noise and disturbance and would be out of character, resulting in an acceptable impact to amenity, contrary to DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

This application differs from the previously refused schemes in the following key areas:

1. The annexe does not form part of this application and is not a consideration.
2. The first floor side extension is no longer part of the proposal.
3. The roof of the rear extension has been altered from a flat roof to a crowned roof design.

The effect of these changes will be assessed in the context of the following:

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The existing patio to the rear will be demolished to make way for the proposal.

The proposed single storey side extension would be set back approximately 3.3m from the front wall of the dwelling. The side extension would be visible from both the street and rear garden environment. The rear extension would extend beyond the flank wall of the original dwelling and create a wrap round side/rear extension with a crowned roof.

The proposed single storey side/rear extension would relate acceptably to the existing property and it is considered the proposal would not unduly impact on the street scene or the 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. No objections are raised from a visual point of view.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

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

It is not envisaged that the single storey side/rear extension would have any impact on the amenity of the detached neighbour at No.25 Glenton Close, due to the separation distance between the proposal and this neighbour, but also due to the screening effect of the existing garage within the application site. The submitted plans indicate that the side extension would have a flank window and door facing No.25.

It is considered that presence of the existing garage would screen views in part from these openings. Mindful that these openings would face the garden and lie at an oblique angle, it is considered that it would be difficult to demonstrate the harm, mindful that the proposal would not result in any undue overlooking or loss of privacy above existing conditions, particularly as the first floor windows of the application dwelling and the neighbouring properties already overlook the rear garden areas of surrounding residential properties.

As a result, it is considered that the proposal would not unacceptably impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbours of No.25 Close.

Similarly, it is considered that the separation distance between the proposal and the neighbouring properties which lie to the rear of the site, would be sufficient to mitigate any potential impact arising from the proposed development.

Although, the single storey rear extension would project further into the rear garden, it is considered that it would be difficult to demonstrate the harm, mindful of the separation distance between the proposal and the properties located to the rear of the site and that the first floor windows of the application dwelling and the neighbouring properties already overlook the rear garden areas of surrounding residential properties. A refusal on a loss of privacy would be difficult to substantiate a refusal on appeal due to the reasons outlined above even though these neighbours to the rear are located at a lower ground level as the properties are located on a hill.

Similarly, these concerns were not raised as a reason for refusal on the previous application and therefore it would be difficult to introduce this matter on this current application.

No.23 Glenton Close would be the property most affected by the proposed development. The first reason for refusal was regarding the impact from the proposed rear extension and its excessive height and position close to the boundaries of the site to No.23. It was considered that the design of the previous proposal was intrusive and an unneighbourly and would have an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers at No. 23 Glenton Close.

The depth of the ground floor rear extension would remain unaltered at 4m deep, which complies with Council guidelines, however, the roof design has been altered on this application, from a flat roof to a crowned roof design to lessen the impact on the boundary with No.23 Glenton Close.

The crown roof would have an eaves line of 3m rising and an overall height of approximately 3.85m. The overall height of the roof would be mitigated by its hipped roof design which would be hipped away from the adjoining neighbours.

The previous designed single storey rear extension which was refused, had a flat roof with a shallow pitch that had an eaves line of 3.4m rising to 3.5m. The revised scheme under consideration has a lower eaves line of 3m with the roof hipping away from the attached neighbour to height of 3.85 approximately, which would be less invasive than the previously refused scheme.

It is considered that the revised roof design would overcome the first reason for refusal for P1454.21 and therefore no objections are raised from a neighbourliness point of view.

Taking the above factors into consideration, and mindful of the general presumption in favour of development, it is considered any impact upon the adjacent neighbours at No.23 Glenton Close to be modest and within that envisaged as acceptable within guidelines.

To safeguard the privacy of the adjoining neighbours, two conditions have been imposed to ensure that no openings will be added to side of the proposed extensions or that the flat roof of the rear extension would not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area, unless specific permission is obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

In all, the development is considered to fall within the spirit of adopted guidelines for householder extensions and the proposal is not deemed to be unneighbourly.

As previously mentioned, the existing patio will be removed to make way for the proposal and although not mentioned on the application form a new patio is proposed, which would be less

than 30cm in height. A patio height more than 30cm would require planning consent and an informative will be added to the decision notice should the application be approved.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The application site is within a PTAL area of 1b. As per Policy 24 of the Havering Local Plan for a site within a PTAL 0 - 1 that has 3 plus bedrooms, the site needs to provide a minimum parking provision of up to 1.5 spaces per dwelling, which is what the application site would be able to provide in the garage and on the front and in fact the on site parking would exceed this.

It is not considered that there are any grounds with which to withhold permission on basis of parking or highways grounds as such, mindful of the parking to the front of the property as well.

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. 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 Land Ownership

Land Ownership Informative

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not give consent for any part of the development including guttering and fascias to encroach onto any land not within the applicant's ownership.

2 Patio or Raised Platform

Patio or Raised Platform Informative

The applicant should note that putting up decking, or other raised platforms, in your garden is permitted development, not needing an application for planning permission, providing:

·The decking is no more than 30cm above the ground

·Together with other extensions, outbuildings etc, the decking or platforms cover no more than 50 per cent of the garden area.

·None of the decking or platform is on land forward of a wall forming the principal elevation.

3 Approval following revision

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, improvements required to make the proposal acceptable were negotiated with Mr Stewart (Agent) by e-mail. The revisions involved sought clarity in respect to the patio. The amendments were subsequently submitted on 07-10-22.

Authorising Officer: Neil Goate
--

25-11-2022
