

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0134.25

WARD: Cranham **Date Received:** 31st January 2025

ADDRESS: 106 Cranham Gardens
Upminster

PROPOSAL: Part single, part two storey side/rear extension and internal alterations with changes/additions to the fenestration & doors.

DRAWING NO(S): 01 Rev C
03 Rev C

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 consists of a detached two storey dwelling located to the eastern side of Cranham Gardens in a predominately residential area. The dwellings either side of the application site comprise detached bungalows. It is not a listed building and is not located in a conservation area nor subject to any articles.

The character of the area is varied with the wider street scene comprising a mix of bungalows, semi-detached and detached and terraced dwellings of varying materials.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for a part single, part two storey side/rear extension and internal alterations with changes/additions to the fenestration and doors.

RELEVANT HISTORY

D0543.24	Certificate of lawfulness for proposed outbuilding
	PP not required 30-01-2025
P0858.08	Enlargement of roof to form pitched roof
	Apprv with cons 24-07-2008

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

A consultation was carried with neighbours in the area, including those adjacent to the site and

behind the site. 2 objections were received, comments summarised below:

- Sizeable development not appropriate in the area
- Loss of daylight
- Loss of outlook

RELEVANT POLICIES

Havering Local Plan (2016)

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

OTHER

National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2024)

Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2011)

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The application is not CIL liable.

STAFF COMMENTS

In accordance with the current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not undertaken. Site photos, and block plans were provided by the applicant in the determination of the application as well as Google StreetView, aerial view images and drawings were used to assess the site constraints.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (adopted 2021) emphasizes that planning permission will only be granted for developments that maintain, enhance, or improve the character and appearance of the local area. This is achieved by responding to distinctive local building forms and patterns of development, and by respecting the scale, massing, and height of the surrounding physical context. Additionally, Policy 26 focuses on ensuring that the appearance of Havering is maintained and, where possible, enhanced by requiring new development to maintain or improve the character and appearance of the local area in its scale and design.

The NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. It also notes that

planning permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

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.

The SPD states that two storey rear extensions should be carefully designed in order to minimise their bulk. It states that for all two storey rear extensions, the roof should be pitched, set at right angles to the main roof and generally finished with a hipped end.

As per SPD guidance, a ground rear extension should be 4 metres from the rear wall of the original house for a semi-detached or detached dwelling. This is to ensure the extension is subordinate to the original dwelling. Any greater depth required should be within an angle of 45 degrees, taken from the 3 metre or 4 metre dimension on the property boundary, in order to ensure a reasonable level of amenity is afforded to neighbouring properties.

The proposed single storey side extension would replace an existing garage and would project the full depth of the existing dwelling and would link with the proposed extension to the rear to form a wraparound extension. The two-storey extension would project approximately 6.5m from the original rear wall at ground floor level and 5m at first floor level with a hipped roof to match the existing building.

The proposed two storey rear extension would exceed the maximum of 4m for a single storey rear extension and 3m for a first floor rear extension in the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document. The proposed two storey rear extension at an excessive depth at both ground and first floor level would add considerable bulk and massing to the host dwelling and would be visually incongruous resulting in detrimental harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Having regard to the above, the design of the part two storey rear extension would appear incongruous and would be harmful to the character of the host dwelling and the rear garden scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 26 of the Local Plan, the Residential Extension and Alterations SPD and the NPPF.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

The SPD states that detached dwellings can have a first floor rear extension of up to 3m depth and should be setback from neighbouring dwellings by approximately 2m as a rule of thumb to mitigate amenity impacts.

The neighbouring property on the north-east No.108 Cranham Gardens is a bungalow which has been extended to the rear at ground floor level. The proposed extension, at first floor level would be offset from the boundary by 2.2m and would introduce no.2 windows in the side elevation which would serve a bathroom and en-suite.

With regards to the impact upon the neighbouring property on the south-west No.104 Cranham Gardens, it is proposed to install no.2 windows at first floor level which would serve a study and a

secondary window to a bedroom. The proposed extension would be set 0.9m from the shared boundary, however, this neighbour benefits from an existing single storey rear extension. The proposed extension would not extend beyond the rear elevation of this neighbour.

Whilst the extensions do not result in any significant loss of outlook or sense of enclosure, their sheer scale, bulk, massing and excessive depth would result in an adverse impact on the visual amenity enjoyed in the adjoining rear amenity space. Had the application been recommended for approval, appropriate conditions could be imposed to ensure any side facing windows be fitted with obscurely glazed to prevent any increased overlooking.

Given the siting of neighbouring dwellings, the proposal is not considered to cause any detrimental effects to the amenity of neighbouring properties that would warrant refusal of planning permission.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

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 development would, by reason of its excessive depth, poor design, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the garden scene harmful to the appearance and visual amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan.

Authorising Officer:



Neil Goate

2nd May 2025