

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P1674.24

WARD: Upminster **Date Received:** 19th December 2024

ADDRESS: 87 HOWARD ROAD
UPMINSTER

PROPOSAL: Single storey front, side and rear extensions and roof extension to create first floor and habitable loft with 1 x rear dormer.

DRAWING NO(S): HR/NAK/01A
HR/NAK/02A

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 relates to a detached bungalow located to the northern side of Howard Road in a predominately residential area. The area is characterised by a mix of bungalow and two storey dwellings with varied architectural styles.

The existing bungalow is constructed in a mix of brickwork and render with a projecting front gable. The house is not a listed building, nor is it within a conservation area or subject to any Article 4 Directions

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission for a single storey front, side and rear extension and loft conversion incorporating flat roofed rear dormer.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P0728.98 Conversion and extension to existing garage into bathroom and bedroom. Approved 14-08-1998

P0728.98	Conversion and extension to existing garage into bathroom and bedroom.
	Apprv with cons 14-08-1998

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Adjoining occupiers were consulted and two representations were received which can be

summarised as:

- The height of the proposed extensions would result in loss of light and sunlight to internal rooms and gardens. Light surveys should be carried out
- The rear dormer extension would increase overlooking
- No other dwellings within Howard Road have added a second floor
- The design of the extensions and roof form is out of character with the area
- Impact on pedestrian and highway safety and increased congestion
- Insufficient parking

OFFICER RESPONSE: Matters relating to the design of the proposed extensions and their impacts on the street and rear garden scenes and amenity of neighbouring properties are addressed below.

RELEVANT POLICIES

Havering Local Plan (2016-31)

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

The London Plan (2021)

- Policy D1 - London's form, character and capacity for growth
- Policy D4 - Delivering good design
- Policy T6 - Car parking

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

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

Contributions would be required under CIL regulations. The proposal would add 111.64sqm. The Mayoral CIL is charged at £25/sqm across Havering. This would equate to a contribution of £2,791 (£25 per sqm). As of 1st September 2019, Havering adopted its on community infrastructure levy (HCIL) which has a chargeable rate of £125 per sqm in this location. This translates to a contribution of £13,955.

STAFF COMMENTS

In accordance with the current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not undertaken. In assessing this application, Google StreetView, aerial view images and 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 that maintain, enhance or improve 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 Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD states that 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. It further states that two storey side extensions should be set back at least one metre from the front wall of the dwelling at first floor level, to create a break in the roofline and facade, and avoid a terracing effect. The ground floor level should not project beyond the main building line on the front elevation and preferably should be set back by at least a brick course to provide a good junction between old and new materials. For rear extensions, the SPD advises that they should have a maximum height of 3 metres to ensure no undue loss of light to neighbouring properties or adversely affect the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

The proposal would essentially replace an existing bungalow with a two storey dwelling with gabled roof that would largely occupy the full width of the plot. It is noted that No.85 (which is currently a bungalow) was recently granted planning permission under planning ref: P1032.24 for the replacement of an existing bungalow with a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellings. Therefore the principle of the converting the existing bungalow to a two storey dwelling is acceptable subject to achieving an acceptable design that responds well to the established character of the area.

An existing hipped roof would be replaced with a gabled roof with the overall height increasing from 5.37m to 7.86m. Gabled roofs are not a characteristic feature of the streetscene which predominately consist of hipped roof forms. The proposed extensions and resulting roof form, by reason of its design and scale, appears excessively bulky and visually incongruous in the streetscene. It would result in a development that would not represent good design and would be out of character with the locality.

The proposal would also incorporate a two-storey front gable projecting 1.4m from the front elevation and measuring 3.54m wide. It would have a pitched roof measuring 5m to the eaves and 7.3m to the ridge. The SPD states that large front extensions are generally unacceptable due to the adverse effect they can have on the appearance of the original house and the character of the street. It is Council policy that front extensions should not normally project more than 1m in depth from the main front wall of the original dwelling. In this case, two storey front gable extensions are not an established characteristic of the streetscene and therefore, by reason of its design, scale and bulk, would be out of character of the locality.

The proposed single storey rear extension would project an additional 3.24m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling and would be built up to the shared boundaries. The proposed side extensions would be built up to the shared boundaries at ground floor level and would be offset 1m from the shared boundaries at first floor level.

Whilst the overall height of the dwelling is acceptable in principle, as it would be similar to nearby houses in the immediate street scene, however, the introduction of a gabled roof is not

characteristic of the streetscene and would therefore be harmful to the character of the area.

With regards to dormer windows, the SPD recognises that roof extensions and alterations can change the appearance and character of the dwelling and states that dormers should be contained to the rear and should sit well within the body of the roof, by being set well back from the eaves, and by setting the sides well in from any gables or party walls.

It is noted from a planning history search that a number of dwellings along Howard Road have been granted Certificate of Lawfulness for the construction of dormer extensions to the rear, however, given the nature of those applications, they have not been assessed against relevant planning policy. In this case, the design of the rear dormer would appear incongruous in the rear garden scene and would be out of character with the dwelling and the locality. It is considered that the combination of the extended roof form, combined with the size of rear dormer, would appear excessively bulky and visually incongruous and does not represent high design quality in accordance with the requirements of Local Plan Policy 26 and the NPPF.

For the reasons given above, the proposed development when considered as a whole would appear incongruous and would fail to integrate with its surroundings. As such, the proposal would be out of character with the host dwelling and the immediate surroundings, contrary to Policy 26 of the Local Plan.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Consideration has been given to the impact on the neighbouring dwellings in terms of loss of light and loss of privacy. Planning permission will not be granted where the proposal results in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/ daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy to existing properties.

With regard to the impact on No.89, which is a two storey dwelling, the proposed side extension would be offset 1m from the boundary at first floor level and would not extend beyond the rear building line. A first floor window would be installed to the flank elevation which would serve a landing and, had the application been recommended for approval, a condition could be secured to ensure this window is obscurely glazed to mitigate any harm. With regards to the single storey rear extension, given it would not extend beyond the existing building line, as No.89 has previously been extended to the side/rear at ground floor level, there would be no significant impact. Concerns have been raised regarding the increased height of the dwellings and its impact upon loss of light to a bathroom window. As this is not a primary habitable room window, any harm would be so substantial to warrant a refusal on neighbouring amenity grounds.

The proposed rear extension would project a maximum of 4.1m at ground floor level from the rear building line of No. 85. The proposed single storey rear extension would incorporate a hipped roof and would measure 2.4m to the eaves and 3.1m to the ridge. In terms of the proposed two storey side extension, no windows are proposed in this elevation. An assessment has also been made with regards to the plans approved under P1032.24 to construct a pair of semi-detached dwellings and no detrimental impact in terms of residential amenity would arise upon this neighbour which would warrant a refusal. However, the approved scheme with respect to the adjoining neighbour has yet to be implemented. Currently there are number of windows on the side elevation of the neighbouring buildings. However, it is clear none of these windows serving a habitable room / or are

the primary source of windows, hence the impact upon the loss of light / sunlight would not warrant a refusal.

With regards to the impact of the proposed rear dormer on the neighbours either side of the host dwelling, it is acknowledged there would be some potential for overlooking onto both neighbouring property, however, this is not considered to be any greater than overlooking typically from a first floor window affording views over the rear garden areas of surrounding neighbouring properties. As such, this element of the proposal is not considered to cause significant harm to amenity of both neighbours either side of the host dwelling.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

Policy 24 of the Havering Local Plan Adopted November 2021 requires at least 1.5 spaces per 3+ bedroom unit. The proposed development would not increase parking or vehicular movements to the site and the proposed development would not affect parking within the site. Therefore no highway or parking issues arise as a result of the proposal.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is not considered 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 REFUSAL - Non Standard

The proposed extensions, by reason of their design, scale and bulk and position close to the boundaries would appear as an overly dominant and visually intrusive form of development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Local Plan Policy 26 and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning.

Authorising Officer:



Habib Neshat

17th April 2025