

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0998.24

WARD: Squirrels Heath **Date Received:** 15th July 2024

ADDRESS: 53 Balgores Lane
Romford

PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension and replacement UPVC windows

DRAWING NO(S): 176/03/ C
176/06/ C
12/202407-TCP A
12/202407-TPP A
176/04/ C

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the reason(s) given at the end of the report

SITE DESCRIPTION

53 Balgores Lane is a detached house situated within the Gidea Park Conservation Area and there are TPO trees nearby. The surrounding area is characterised by two-storey detached properties.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The applicant is seeking planning consent for a single storey rear extension and replacement UPVC windows.

RELEVANT HISTORY

T0079.24	Tree Pruning
	1 x Beech, to be reduced by 2m, to appropriate growth points, in accordance with BS3998.
	1 x Hornbeam, to be reduced by 2m, to appropriate growth points, in accordance with BS3998.
	1 x Pear, to be reduced by 1.5m, to appropriate growth points, in accordance with BS3998.
	No TPO
	1 x magnolia to be reduced by 1.5m to appropriate growth points, in accordance with BS3998

	Tree Work App + Cond	06-08-2024
W0149.24	Single story rear extension.	
	Awaiting Decision	
T0001.20	-Beech tree T1 and Hornbeam T2 , crowns reduced and thinned through but to keep overall present shape. - Pear tree T3 , crown reduced and thinned through but to keep present overall shape. - Magnolia ,(NO TPO) top reduction and some lower branch removal in order to let light penetrate to beech hedge behind , as hedge is becoming very thin and is in danger of dying through lack of light	
	Tree Work App + Cond	19-02-2020
P1513.03	Extension of existing hardstanding to front garden.	
	Apprv with cons	29-09-2003
P0229.01	Installation of 2 x satellite dishes	
	Apprv with cons	10-04-2001

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Letters were sent to the immediate neighbouring properties. Objections and photos have been received from four neighbours with the following comments:

- Rear extension is too high and too deep.
- Loss of light and overshadowing.
- Loss of view from windows.
- Impact on plants on boundary.
- Out of character of heritage area, others have been refused, will set a precedent.

These comments are carefully considered in the amenity section of this report; however the impact on plants along the boundary is not a material planning consideration in this case.

Havering Council's Heritage Advisor - Object. Please refer to the Staff Comments Section in this report.

Gidea Park and District Civic Society - Object.

Havering Council's Arboriculture Advisor - No objection subject to conditions. Please refer to the Trees Section in this report.

An in-person site visit was not undertaken. In determining this planning application, photos, Google street view, aerial view images and submitted drawings were used to assess the site constraints.

RELEVANT POLICIES

Havering Local Plan Adopted November 2021

- Policy 7 Residential Design and Amenity
- Policy 24 Parking provision and design

- Policy 26 Urban Design
- Policy 27 Landscaping
- Policy 28 Heritage Assets

Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document Adopted 2011

- Section 5 Rear extensions

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

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

STAFF COMMENTS

This application is for constructing a single storey rear extension and replacement of the existing single-glazed timber windows with double-glazed UPVC windows.

The application site comprises a detached house in the Gidea Park Conservation Area. The special interest of the Conservation Area is derived from the high-quality built environment influenced by the 1910/11 and 1934 Exhibition Houses and the planned verdant garden suburb layout of the estate. No. 53 Balgores Lane was constructed between 1912 and 1928 and was not part of the 1910/11 Exhibition. However, it embodies the Revival of Arts and Crafts ethos of the first exhibition houses, showcasing vernacular details and materials. Despite the addition of single-storey front and rear extensions, the original 'L' form and vernacular detailing remain discernible. The soft landscaped garden to the front and mature trees in the garden also contribute positively to the spacious and verdant character of the Conservation Area. The character appraisal for the Conservation Area has identified the site as making a 'neutral contribution' to the area.

From a heritage perspective, there is no in-principle objection to a rear extension. Given the prevailing context, rear extensions are generally acceptable within the Conservation Area, provided they are of modest scale, appropriate design, and suitable materials. In this case, the proposed extension's depth is not considered overwhelming for the plot or the principal building. It would be contained within the existing paved terrace, thus not reducing the garden size to an extent that would adversely impact the area's spacious character. The proposed extension would not extend beyond the established rear building line at Balgores Lane. Although the loss of historic fabric in the rear elevation is regrettable, it is not considered to diminish the site's current contribution or adversely impact the significance of the Conservation Area. However, the proposed roof form with a faux pitch to the rear is considered poor and would not complement the built character of the Conservation Area.

From a general street scene and design perspective, the height of the single storey rear extension would be more than 3m with a flat roof (3.3m) failing to meet the guidance in the SPD; the roof would be too bulky and high and would fail to integrate well with the main house or the immediate garden scene. The height would need to be lowered to 3m or less. The depth would be between 4.6m and 4m of the rear wall of the original house, failing to meet the 4m guidance in the SPD for a detached house; however the rear extension would be within the existing rear building lines of both

neighbouring houses so it would not appear too large in terms of depth.

With regards to the window replacement from wooden to UPVC, a heritage statement is included in the submission which does not assess the significance of the existing windows or the potential impact of their replacement with double-glazed UPVC units. The existing single-glazed timber casement windows in the building are integral to its character and make an important contribution to the architectural interest and aesthetic value of the property. Consequently, these are attributable to the contribution the site currently makes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such, there is a strong presumption against their replacement with modern double glazed UPVC windows to ensure their contribution to the significance of the conservation area is safeguarded. Historic England's Guidance on Traditional Windows (2017) highlights the value of original windows and supports their retention wherever possible. Therefore, the loss of the historic, likely original, timber windows would only be acceptable if fully justified with a condition survey to demonstrate that the existing windows are beyond viable repair. With respect to the thermal efficiency, repairing the existing windows to improve their thermal performance should be the first consideration. Draught proofing and addition of secondary glazing are thermal upgrading options when compatible to the historic properties. Further information is outlined in the Historic England guidance note on windows Traditional Windows - Their Care, Repair and Upgrading. The guidance note is available at <https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/traditional-windows-care-repair-upgrading>.

Regarding the proposed replacement windows, it is important to note that UPVC windows are considered incompatible with the prevailing character and special interest of the Conservation Area. The adopted character appraisal recognizes UPVC windows as detrimental to the area's special architectural interest. While the proposed replacement UPVC windows would maintain the existing design, in so much as they would feature glazing bars, however these bars will be surface mounted and not integral to the windowpane. Consequently, their aesthetic quality, combined with the glare and reflection from modern double glazing, would not align with the prevailing architectural character of the Conservation Area.

Although UPVC windows exist within the immediate context of the site, they do not complement the special interest of the Conservation Area. The Local Planning Authority should ensure that poor examples within the Conservation Area do not set a precedent for future proposals. Windows are an important element of the architectural interest of the Conservation Area. Therefore, new replacement windows should raise standards in terms of material, design, detailing, and appearance to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area (Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990). It is important to consider that, even if the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised by unsympathetic development in the past, additional changes should be carefully evaluated to avoid further detracting from the asset's significance.

Overall, the proposed UPVC windows and the roof of the rear extension would not preserve the contribution the site makes to the Conservation Area, therefore Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is relevant. With regard to the NPPF, the loss of the existing windows and replacement double glazed UPVC units and the roof of the extension are considered to cause a low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. Such harm makes the application subject to a planning balance under Paragraph 208 and clear and convincing justification is required under Paragraph 206.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Consideration has been given to the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring properties, primarily in respect of overshadowing, loss of light and loss of privacy.

As already mentioned, the height of the single storey rear extension would be more than 3m with a flat roof (3.3m) failing to meet the guidance in the SPD and the depth would be between 4.6m and 4m of the rear wall of the original house, failing to meet the 4m guidance in the SPD for a detached house; however the rear extension would be within the existing rear building lines of both neighbouring houses so it would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity to the rear windows of both neighbouring houses. Objections have been received with regards to the impact of light on neighbouring flank windows but after careful assessment, these windows are not primary habitable room windows so it would be difficult to refuse this application on this basis.

There would be no flank windows in the extension and no overlooking issues.

A condition should be added to any approval to prevent the roof of the rear extension from being used as a balcony.

A condition should be added to any approval to ensure that no windows are placed in the flank walls.

Overall, the development is considered to fall within the guidelines in the Supplementary Planning Guidance (Adopted 2011) for householder extensions and the proposal is not deemed to be unneighbourly.

Overall, the scheme is not considered unneighbourly.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

There are no highway implications. There is sufficient off-road parking to the front of the property.

TREES

Havering Council's Arboriculture Advisor was not consulted during the course of this planning application as there are 9 individual trees, tree groups and hedges on and within 15m of the redline boundary of the site. An Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan has been submitted with this application. No trees require removal to facilitate the development and there will be no direct impacts to the root protection areas of any tree. The Tree Protection plan shows protection measures and a condition is recommended to ensure this if approval is given. There are no Arboricultural justifications to object to this planning application.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

Refusal is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the following reason(s)

1 Refusal non standard

The proposal would, by reason of the materials, bulk and mass, be visually intrusive and harmful to the character and appearance of this heritage asset as well as the street and garden scene generally and would fail to preserve or enhance the Gidea Park Conservation Area contrary to Policies 26 and 28 of the adopted Havering Local Plan and the Heritage Supplementary Planning Document and the NPPF. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is relevant. Regarding the NPPF, a low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area is envisaged. The rear proposed extension and roof changes would adversely affect the architectural interest of a non-designated heritage asset, which makes the application subject to Paragraph 209 of the NPPF.

INFORMATIVES

1 Refusal - No negotiation

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, it was necessary to issue a decision as close to the statutory timeframe as possible as opposed to seeking amendments which would have significantly delayed the application.

Authorising Officer:



Raphael Adenegan

21st October 2024