

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0182.24

WARD: Havering-atte-Bower **Date Received:** 7th February 2024

ADDRESS: 175 Highfield Road
Romford

PROPOSAL: Two storey side extension

DRAWING NO(S): Site Plan
Location Plan
HE175/RM5/001 Rev.P4
HE175/RM5/002 Rev.P3
HE175/RM5/003 Rev.P4

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 dwelling is a two storey end terraced dwelling located on Highfield Road in Romford. The application dwelling is located on a hill adjacent to a terraced property on one side and a three storey unit with commercial at ground floor and residential at first and second floor.

The application dwelling is rendered to the front dwelling with a face brick appearance to the side and rear. There is a significant drop in ground level between the detached neighbour and the application site due to the properties being located on a hill. Car parking to the front of the site. The area is characterised by residential terraced blocks and commercial units at ground floor with two storey residential dwellings.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P1316.23	Two storey side extension	
	Refuse	30-11-2023

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

No representations were received in response to this application.

RELEVANT POLICIES

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

London Plan (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 T6 - Car parking

Havering Local Plan (2016 - 2031)

Policy 7 Residential design and amenity

Policy 24 Parking provision and design

Policy 26 Urban design

LDF

SPD04 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The proposal includes the creation of less than 100sqm of residential Gross Internal floor Area (GIA) and is therefore not liable for CIL payments.

STAFF COMMENTS

In accordance with the current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not initially 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. However, following concerns adjoining neighbours were not notified the case officer visited the site.

It was noted that neighbouring flats were not notified. A further re-consultation was undertaken to include these neighbours for a further 21 days. Revised plans were received altering the design of the proposal as it projected beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring flats.

This application is a resubmission of a previously refused planning application P1316.23. The key issue in this case therefore is whether the revised proposal overcomes the previously stated concerns. The previous application was refused planning permission for the following reasons.

1. The proposed development by reason of its cramped appearance, excessive width, scale, bulk, mass and design would appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Havering Local Plan

Policies 7 and 26 and the design guidance within the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

2. The proposed two storey side extension would result in an uncharacteristic confined relationship with the detached neighbour. It has not been demonstrated that this relationship combined with the depth, height and position to the boundary would not be detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers contrary to Havering Local Plan Policies 7 and 26 and the design guidance within the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

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

1. The width and depth of the first floor side extension has been reduced.
2. The width of the ground floor side extension has been reduced
3. A gabled roof is proposed over the first floor side extension instead of a hipped roof.

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

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

General Design Principles in the SPD guidance states that "While extensions and alterations can bring many benefits to the householder in terms of extra space and security, they can also undermine the original character of both the property they are associated with and the street they are situated within. It is important that extensions and alterations do not dominate or detract from the character of the original house and the surrounding houses, or unacceptably reduce the amenity of neighbouring properties".

Furthermore, the SPD states that "The character of many streets in the borough is derived from the uniform spacing of dwellings. Side extensions should be carefully designed so they do not interrupt this rhythm and do not detract from Havering's open and spacious character. Side extensions are highly visible from the street, so it is important that their design closely reflects the original house in terms of finishing materials, roof style and positioning and style of windows".

The application dwelling is within a group of seventeen terraced properties with a gap between the application dwelling and the neighbouring three storey terraced unit with commercial at ground floor and residential at first and two storey levels. The end terraces on either end which includes the application dwelling are designed with a gabled roof and this is a design feature within this section of Highfield Road.

The SPD outlines for an even row of terraces, side extensions should normally continue the existing building line of the front elevation, so that the architectural rhythm of the street is maintained. The application dwelling and site is located at a lower ground level than the detached three storey unit.

No objections are raised to the roof lights on top of the single storey side extension from a visual point of view.

The proposal would be an irregular shaped two storey side extension and be finished with a gabled roof on this this re-submission. The first floor side extension would be set back at first floor level at the front and rear of this extension to create a break in the roof line with a mono-pitched connecting the ground and first floor side extension.

The proposal would be an extension to the existing dwelling and not a new dwelling. A condition would be imposed to ensure that no openings apart for those shown on the drawing will be added unless consent is obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Furthermore, a condition would be imposed that the two storey side extension would remain as part of the dwelling house known as No.175 Highfield Road. The proposed ground floor extension will be screened by the neighbouring three storey building with commercial at ground floor and residential above.

The development as revised is considered to be generally subservient in appearance and it is considered to be of acceptable design and will relate well with the existing dwelling in terms of bulk, scale and massing.

No objections are raised to the development from a visual impact point of view.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Consideration has been given to the impact of the development on neighbouring dwellings particularly in respect of light loss, outlook and potential loss of privacy.

It is considered 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.

The two storey side extension would be located on the north east side of the application dwelling.

It is not envisaged that the proposal would have any impact on the amenity of the attached neighbour at No.173 Highfield Road as they are located to the south west and the proposal would be located on the opposite side of the dwelling and be screened by the application dwelling. The proposal would be set back from the front elevation and would not project beyond the rear elevation of the application dwelling. As a result, it is considered that the proposal would not unacceptably impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbours at No.173 Highfield Road.

The proposed ground floor side extension would be built up to the boundary with the neighbouring ground floor commercial unit and flat above to the north east of the site. Following photos being provided by the agent and a site visit by the officer, it is noted that this neighbouring three storey unit is on a higher ground level compared to the application dwelling, due to the properties being located on a hill.

The proposal has been revised so the first floor side extension would not project beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring flat to the north east. In addition, the neighbouring flat is on a higher ground level due to the properties being located on a hill.

It is considered the proposal as revised would not unacceptably impact on the neighbouring flats as shown on the submitted plans. The first floor side extension would be mitigated in part by the neighbouring three storey building.

Given these circumstances and mindful of the general presumption in favour of development, Staff consider any impact upon this neighbour 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 ground floor side 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.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The application site is within a PTAL area of 2. As per The London Plan 2021 Policy T6.1 that for a site within Outer London PTAL 2-3 that has 3 plus bedrooms, the site only needs to provide a maximum parking provision of up to 1 space per dwelling, which is what the application site would be able to provide.

The revised proposal would only provide 1 additional bedroom compared to the previous 3 bedroom shown on the refused application. Mindful of the parameters set out by the London Plan above and due to the fact the site is close to a bus service, it is considered that the existing parking arrangement would be acceptable for an extension to the dwelling house and not for a new dwelling.

No highway or parking issues would arise as a result of the proposal for an extension to the dwelling house, as it would comply with parking standard within the London Plan.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal has been revised sufficiently from the earlier refused scheme. The application is now 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 condition(s)

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 SC31 (Use as part of main dwelling)

The extension hereby permitted shall be used only for living accommodation as an integral part of the existing dwelling known as No.175 Highfield Road, Romford and shall not be used as a separate unit of residential accommodation at any time.

Reason:-

The site is within an area where the Local Planning Authority consider that the sub-division of existing properties should not be permitted in the interests of amenity.

4 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.

5 No windows or doors in front or flank elevations

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no windows or doors other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed in the front or flank elevations of the extension hereby permitted.

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.

6 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 Use of Dwelling Informative

Use of Dwelling Informative

The applicant should note that the application under consideration is in respect of a two storey side extension as described to a residential dwelling, and not for a new dwelling. Separate planning consent would be required for a new dwelling or any change of use to a House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO).

2 Land Ownership Informative

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.

3 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>

4 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 m Seemampillai by phone and e-mail. The revisions involved the increasing the footprint of ground floor side extension and reducing the depth of the first floor side extension. The amendments were subsequently submitted on 08/04/24 & 09/04/24.

Authorising Officer:

Simon Thelwell

