

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0455.25

WARD: Hylands & Harrow Lg **Date Received:** 28th March 2025

ADDRESS: 47 Harrow Drive
Hornchurch

PROPOSAL: Part single, part double storey rear extension, single storey front extension, garage conversion to habitable space, alterations to fenestration and loft conversion with rear dormer and rooflights to front

DRAWING NO(S): 3118/07
3118/06 D

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 2-storey dwelling house. The property is not listed, nor is it within a conservation area. No trees will be affected as a result of this proposal. The surrounding area is residential in nature, containing mainly detached and semi-detached houses. There are various extensions in close proximity.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The applicant is seeking planning consent for a part single, part double storey rear extension, single storey front extension, garage conversion to habitable space, alterations to fenestration and loft conversion with rear dormer and roof-lights to front.

Pre-application advice was sought and the scheme presented was deemed unacceptable.

A smaller scheme was approved via planning application P1026.20.

RELEVANT HISTORY

W0317.23	Room in roof, single storey, rear and side extension Awaiting Decision
P1026.20	Part two storey side, part single rear extensions; and conversion of garage to habitable use involving changes to front elevation. Apprv with cons 21-09-2020

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Letters were sent to the immediate neighbouring properties. One objection was received with the following comment:

- overlooking.

This is discussed later on this report.

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 6 Side extensions
- Section 7 Front and porch extensions
- Section 8 Roof extensions, loft conversions and dormer windows

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

Contributions would be required under CIL regulations. According to the application form, the proposal would result in a net increase of 109m².

This would translate to a Mayoral CIL (MCIL2) contribution of £2725 /(x £25 per sqm).

As of September 1st 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 £13,625.

Each contribution would be subject to indexation.

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

The front store room although of a significant depth of 2.5m, would appear simialr to that at no.43, and given the set back from the street not considered to be unduly harmful.

GARAGE CONVERSION:

The garage conversion would have minimal impact on the street scene,

REAR EXTENSIONS:

The height of the single storey rear extension would be 3m with a flat roof meeting guidance in the SPD. However the depth of 6m would fail to meet the 4m guideline in the SPD. However both neighbouring houses have rear extensions and the extension would sit comfortably on the site.

The infill first floor rear extension has already been approved in application P1026.20. A further first floor rear extension with a depth of 3m from the rear wall of the main house is proposed, meeting SPD guidance. The width would be 5.6m and consideration was made to refuse on the basis of a disproportionate addition but it would be difficult to refuse on this basis as there is an extension at no.49 with a similar width (planning reference: P0247.21). However, the proposed flat roof design would be unacceptable. It is acknowledged that the infill extension allowed in application P1026.20 had a flat roof but the continuation of it 3m deeper would appear out of place and poor design.

REAR DORMER AND PART HIP TO GABLE ROOF EXTENSION:

Section 8 of the SPD states that rear 'dormers should be contained 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'. The pair of rear dormers would have a height of 1.7m, a width of 1.2m and would be well set in from the top of the roof and the eaves, meeting the above guidance.

The dormer would be large and across the whole of the rear roof and would appear as an unacceptable and bulky addition to the dwelling. Similarly the part hip to gable extension would unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses and appear out of place. The rear dormers allowed at the neighbouring house at no.49 are much smaller.

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.

The garage conversion and front extension would have no amenity impact.

The single storey rear extension would sit next to rear extensions at both neighbouring houses and would be less than 4m from these building lines so there would be minimal amenity impact.

The windows in the rear dormer would not be significantly different from the existing site conditions in terms of the existing first floor windows in the host property facing the rear gardens, and therefore is considered acceptable with no significant increase in overlooking or loss of privacy to any nearby neighbour.

The part hip to gable extension would have minimal impact on the neighbour at no.45 as this dwelling has no flank habitable room windows.

It is considered that the proposed first floor rear extension would have minimal impact on the neighbour at no.49 as it would be more than 2m from the shared boundary. However the first floor rear extension would by reason of its scale, bulk, poor design and proximity to the boundary with the neighbouring property no.45, just over a metre from the boundary unlike the 2m distance recommended in the SPD, thus it would be an intrusive, overbearing and unneighbourly development that would have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of these adjacent occupiers and their rear first floor windows in terms of loss of outlook and sense of enclosure. The excessive width of the dormer and the flat roof design out of keeping with the character of the host property would form prominent and visually intrusive features in the rear garden environment to the detriment of the visual amenity of the locality contrary to Policy 26.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

There are no highway issues with ample parking on the site frontage.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

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 extension would, by reason of its scale, bulk and proximity to the neighbouring property no.45 Harrow Drive, be 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 - Streetscene

The proposed first floor rear extension, rear dormer and part hip to gable roof extension would, by reason of their bulk and mass close to the boundaries of the site and poor design, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the rear garden environment to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host property and visual amenity of the locality 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.

2 CIL informative for refused proposal - Residential

Please be advised that approval of this application from 1st September 2019 (either by London Borough of Havering, or subsequently by PINS if allowed on appeal following a refusal by London Borough of Havering) will attract a liability payment.

London Borough of Havering, as CIL collecting authority, has responsibility for the collection of the Mayoral CIL, in addition to Havering's CIL, on commencement of the development.

Your proposal is subject to to a Mayoral CIL (MCIL2) contribution of £2725 /(x £25 per sqm). As of September 1st 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 £13,625.

Each contribution would be subject to indexation.

You are advised to visit the planning portal website where you can download the appropriate document templates.

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil>

Authorising Officer:



Neil Goate

3rd June 2025