

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P1317.24

WARD: Rainham & Wennington **Date Received:** 1st October 2024

ADDRESS: 44 Parsonage Road
Rainham

PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension, creation of first floor with rear projection and fenestration changes to front elevation

DRAWING NO(S): 44-000
44-003
44-005

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

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site houses a semi-detached residential bungalow with a single-storey rear extension. The property is not listed, nor is it within a conservation area. The surrounding area is residential in nature, containing mainly semi-detached properties. There are various extensions in close proximity. The site is located in a landfill buffer zone and a condition should be applied to any approval requesting gas migration information.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The applicant is seeking planning consent for a single-storey rear extension, the creation of a first floor with rear projection and fenestration changes to the front elevation.

This application is a re-submission of a refused planning application (reference: P0105.24) for single and first floor two storey rear extensions with a full-width balcony, including a loft conversion and front and side roof-lights. The refusal reasons were:

1. The proposed development, would by reasons of the scale, massing and the general design, appear as a dominant and visually intrusive development when viewed from the rear garden of the immediate neighbours, out of scale and character with the site and surrounding area, and is therefore contrary to Policy 26 of Havering Local Plan and Section 8 of the Residential Extension and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document Adopted 2011.
2. The proposed first floor extension and balcony, would create a contrived and visually discordant roof form, not sympathetic to the architectural composition of the existing building and character of the surrounding area, and as such is contrary to Policy 26 of the Havering

Local Plan and would be unacceptable.

3. The proposed first floor full-width rear balcony would, by reasons of its location, scale, material and design result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the neighbouring amenity areas, which would adversely impact on their living conditions, therefore contrary to Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan and Sections 5 and 8 of the Residential Extensions and Alterations SDP and is deemed acceptable.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P0892.24	Single storey rear extension, creation of first floor to include fenestration changes to front elevation	
	Withdrawn - Invalid	08-08-2024
P0105.24	Single and first floor two storey rear extensions with full-width balcony, including loft conversion, front and side rooflights.	
	Refuse	02-05-2024

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

A statutory consultation was carried out with neighbours adjoining the site by way of direct notification. No representations were received in response to this consultation.

RELEVANT POLICIES

Havering Local Plan Adopted November 2021

- Policy 7 Residential Design and Amenity
- Policy 24 Parking provision and design
- Policy 26 Urban Design

Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document Adopted 2011 (SPD)

- Section 5 Rear extensions
- Section 8 Loft extensions

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

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

STAFF COMMENTS

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.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan (Adopted 2021) states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area by responding to distinctive local building forms and patterns of development and by respecting the scale, massing and height of the surrounding physical context. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) reinforces this by placing emphasis on good quality, design and architecture. The NPPF requires that planning decisions ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.

The front fenestration changes with the relocation of the front door would have minimal impact on the street scene.

The single-storey rear extension would be 4m in depth but the cumulative depth of extensions from the rear wall of the original dwelling would be 6.7m, exceeding the recommended maximum of 4m in the guidance outlined within the SPD for semi-detached housing. However in this case, the depth is considered acceptable as both neighbours have rear extensions. The height would be less than 3m in height with a flat roof, meeting SPD guidance. It is considered that the proposal is acceptably designed, would integrate well with the existing dwelling and will not unduly impact upon the immediate garden scene. There would be adequate garden space left over for the residents to enjoy.

The creation of a first floor on this bungalow would not increase the overall roof height which would remain at 4.842m in height. There would be minimal impact on the street-scene from the front elevation with the only change being the insertion of 3 small velux windows in the roof. However, the impact of the proposal on the garden scene from the rear elevation would be significant with a bulky rear projection across the whole width of the dwelling and 3.75m in depth from the original main rear building line. The rear projection should be assessed as a first floor rear extension; it would have a depth which exceeds the maximum of 3m depth guidance in the SPD. It would extend the entire width of the house and it would be bulky and insubordinate. It is considered, as a result, that the rear loft conversion / rear first floor projection would result in an elongation of the existing building to the rear creating an intrusive and overbearing form of development, which would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. The amended scheme has not satisfactorily addressed the previous reason for refusal and is still unacceptable; a rear dormer is more suitable in this location.

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 outlook.

The front fenestration changes with the relocation of the front door would have minimal impact on the amenity of nearby neighbours.

The single-storey rear extension would have minimal impact on the amenity of both neighbouring houses as both neighbours have rear extensions and the proposed extension would be less than

4m from their rear building lines. It is acknowledged that the extension may affect light to a flank window at the extension at no.42 but given that the window is on an extension, less weight is given to the impact the current proposals might have on it and it would be difficult to refuse on this basis. There would be no windows in the flank walls of the extension so there are no overlooking issues. A condition could ensure that the flat roof of the rear extension is not used as a balcony area to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy.

As already mentioned in the street scene section above, the rear projection should be assessed as a first floor rear extension; it would have a depth which exceeds the maximum of 3m depth guidance in the SPD (3.75m from the rear building line of the main original dwelling). It would extend the entire width of the house and it would be bulky and have no or little spacing to the side boundaries. The first floor rear projection would therefore extend to the same depth as the rear projection at no.46, but at two storeys with a height of 4.3m close to the shared boundary which would have an overbearing impact on the amenity enjoyed from their immediate private amenity space (patio) at the rear of the dwelling.

It is noted that both neighbouring properties are bungalows with no first floor windows so the proposal would not affect amenity in terms of the upper rear elevations of both neighbours. However, there is a habitable room window to the flank wall of the neighbour at no.46 Parsonage Road and the depth, scale and bulk of the proposal would lead to an unacceptable loss of outlook and overshadowing to this window. As mentioned above, it is acknowledged that the extension may affect light to a flank window at the extension at no.42 but given that the window is on an extension, less weight is given to the impact the current proposals might have on it and it would be difficult to refuse on this basis. Similarly the impact on roof velux windows at no.42 would be difficult to refuse.

Overall, the first floor rear extension is considered to be unneighbourly.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

No highway issues. The extensions do not result in a loss of parking created so there are no highway reasons to refuse this application.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

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

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1 Reason for refusal - Residential Extensions

The proposed first floor rear loft extension would, by reason of its depth, bulk and proximity to the boundary with the neighbouring property no.46 Parsonage Road, give rise to an intrusive, overbearing and unneighbourly development that would have a significant adverse effect on

the amenities of these adjacent occupiers contrary to Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

2 Reason for refusal - Rear garden scene

The proposed first floor rear loft extension would appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the rear garden environment harmful to the established character and appearance of the host property and visual amenity of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan, and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

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:



Neil Goate

26th November 2024