

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0608.25

WARD: Beam Park **Date Received:** 2nd May 2025

ADDRESS: 14 Christchurch Avenue
Rainham

PROPOSAL: Part retrospective application for a two storey side extension

DRAWING NO(S): PL 02
PL 05
PL 06
PL 08

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

SITE DESCRIPTION

14 Christchurch Avenue is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located in Rainham located on a bend of the road. The dwelling is directly adjoined by no. 16 Christchurch Avenue. The street comprises of a mix of terraced blocks and semi-detached dwellings, though semi-detached dwellings have the strongest presence on the street.

There is a two storey side later addition to the building which has been built without the benefit of planning permission.

There is also front porch which does not appear on the drawings. Further, the front drive has been completely covered in hard surface.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The submitted planning application seeks planning permission for a two-storey side extension; it is part retrospective as the extension has already been built, albeit with a flat roof. The plans show an alternative scheme with the main difference between the existing unauthorised side extension and what is included in the proposal is that the proposal will include a side hipped roof.

This is a re-submission of previously refused scheme Ref; P0004.23.

RELEVANT HISTORY

This application follows a similar application which was refused

W0032.25	Part retrospective planning for double storey extension to accommodate accessible bedroom and bathroom	
	A double storey extension has been built, which is now under enforcement. The proposal includes changes to the roof to match the original house pitch. There are several houses nearby which have received planning for the same. The extension has been built to accommodate the husband who has become permanently disabled and requires a wheelchair. The works are carried out due to the husband's incident where he woke up from sleep and became paralysed, he is in a full time wheelchair and has carers 24 hours a day to do all actions. He was in very good condition before this incident happened over night, he had a very good job with the council. His wife also had a very good job at a school, but she had to leave her job to become a carer for her husband. This sad incident transformed their life in an instant. The extension allows for a ground floor bedroom and accessible bathroom, the bedroom on first floor allows for additional space for carer. Awaiting Decision	
P0004.23	Two storey side extension (Part Retrospective)	
	Refuse	19-09-2023
P1399.22	Two storey side extension	
	Withdrawn	30-11-2022
P1163.22	Two storey side extension	
	Withdrawn - Invalid	22-08-2022
P0918.22	Double storey side extension	
	Withdrawn - Invalid	14-07-2022

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours were notified via letter - three residents have commented. Their response is as follows:

- The extension has already been built, there is an enforcement file open.
- The demolition of outbuildings adjoining a brick built shed at no.12- no party wall discussions.
- Loss of light to no.12.
- Other extensions are smaller and set much further back.
- Poor spacing to no.12 and the front, overdevelopment and looks out of place.
- No access to the rear garden from outside.
- The small roof detail between ground and first floor has no gutter.

This application has been called in by the Ward Councillor citing the following concerns; harmonious appearance of neighbouring properties.

4.23 In streets with detached and semi-detached houses, spacing between buildings can form a characteristic part of the street, particularly where the spacing is consistent in distance. Side extensions have the potential to interrupt this pattern to the detriment of the street and therefore should normally be subordinate in size and set back from the front building line.

6.6 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

11.3 To support biodiversity, wherever possible the opportunity to create new areas of wildlife habitat should be taken. For example, extensions and alterations may allow incorporation of features such as green walls, balconies and roofs, or nesting and roosting spaces.

Local Development Framework DC41 indicates that substitute or recycled materials should be used, this has not been done and cannot be achieved due to the premature building of the extension.

Local Development Framework DC48 indicates that sustainable drainage should be used, the hardstanding laid out in conjunction with the extension does not meet this requirement.

Local Development Framework DC51 lays out requirements for water recycling, no information has been provided as to how this will be achieved.

The relevant issues would be discussed below.

RELEVANT POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework

Havering Local Plan (2016 - 2031)

Policy 7 Residential design and amenity
Policy 24 Parking provision and design
Policy 26 Urban design

London Plan (2021)
Policy D4 Delivering good design

Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2011)

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

Not CIL liable.

STAFF COMMENTS

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

As noted above, it appears the submitted planning application proposes an alternative design to the already constructed unauthorised extension and has received an enforcement complaints under file ENF/57/22. The plans include a provision for a dual pitched roof over the already built flat roof. The dimensions of the existing unauthorised extension and the dimensions included in the proposal on the ground and first floor appear to be the same, although there are some discrepancies between some of the submitted drawings. It is further noted that the apex of the flat roof exceeds the height of the eaves of the roof of the main dwelling-house.

It is noted that there is the provision of hardstanding to the front of the site possibly without a sustainable urban drainage system as well as a front porch which appears to need planning permission. While the applicant is not required to include the works with the hardstanding and the porch within the submitted planning application, an informative will be attached to the decision stating that planning permission will be likely be required for the hardstanding and porch to the front.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan outlines that development will only be granted permission if it is of an acceptable design and scale. The Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD provides further design guidance for householder development. Semi-detached dwellings should be subordinate to the existing dwellinghouse to ensure that the semi-detached dwellings remain in balance and should further maintain a characteristic gap between semi-detached pairs. This is achieved by extensions featuring a setback of at least one metre from the front elevation on the first floor. The ground floor of the side extension should further preferably feature a minor setback.

Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan outlines that development will only be granted permission if it is of an acceptable design and scale. The Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD provides further design guidance for householder development. Semi-detached dwellings should be subordinate to the existing dwellinghouse to ensure that the semi-detached dwellings remain in balance and should further maintain a characteristic gap between semi-detached pairs. This is achieved by extensions featuring a setback of at least one metre from the front elevation on the first floor. The ground floor of the side extension should further preferably feature a minor setback.

The site is located in a prominent position on a bend of the road. The bulk of the proposed has been built and is already occupied. This two storey extension comprises a flat roof and is marginally set back from the main roof. Furthermore, it is noted that the materials used are of a poor match to the existing dwellinghouse and contributes to the overall poor design of the extension. Given the corner position of the application site, the proposed extension would protrudes in front of the adjoining dwelling and appear quite prominent, and given its flat roof design it would appear as incongruous

thereby having adverse impact upon the street scene.

The proposal is to demolish the front of the extension, and set the building back by a metre from the front elevation and incorporate a hipped roof.

It is noted that a number of dwellings on Christchurch Avenue have two-storey extensions but all that have received planning permission feature a setback that is more in line with the guidance of the SPD.

The issue with the proposed scheme, is that despite the proposed set back, the extension would still project in front of the neighbour, with the flank elevation would appear prominent creating an awkward relation with its neighbour and the street scene.

It is also noted that there are significant inaccuracies in the drawings as follows;

- the windows to the existing house have not been drawn accurately - they appear to be shown lower on the drawings than they actually are on the house .

- the drawings reflecting the proposal, indicates that the lowered window would be in line with the window of the first floor level of the existing house which could not actually be physically achieved in site in reality.

- the proposed roof plan and the flank elevation do not correspond - with the roof profile of the proposal having different pitches to the host dwelling, could not actually be constructed.

All such inaccuracies means that the Local Planning Authority is not convinced that a satisfactory solution could be achieved.

Therefore, it is not considered that the proposal would overcome the concern previously raised, and the concern with respect to the harm to the visual amenity will remain.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan outlines that consideration should be given to the potential impact of developments on neighbouring occupiers, particularly with reference to loss of light, outlook and impact to privacy.

In terms of the impact on 12 Christchurch Avenue, objections have been received regarding the experienced loss of light in the habitable room towards the front of the house due to the erection of the extension. However, it would be difficult to refuse this application on the basis of loss of light as the extension would be situated so that the impact on light to habitable rooms at no.12 would be minimal. The side facing window of no.12 does not serve a habitable room and it would be unreasonable to refuse this application on the impact on light to a non-habitable room. The rear and front elevations of the extension will be facing away from no. 12 and with no provision of windows on the side elevation, the extension represents no concerns with regards to impact on privacy or overlooking.

In terms of the impact on 16 Christchurch Avenue, the development will be sited away from the neighbouring dwelling and due to the extension maintaining the building line of the semi-detached pair, the extension represents no concerns with regard to the above mentioned criteria in

determining impact to neighbouring amenity.

The extension is not deemed unneighbourly.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The development does not raise any concerns with regards to impact to parking/highways.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The extension is not in accordance with planning policy and is therefore recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1 Reason for refusal - Streetscene

The proposed development would, by reason of its poor design, height, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene on this prominent corner site, thereby having an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Policy 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan.

INFORMATIVES

1 Refusal - No negotiation ENTER DETAILS

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 Non Standard Informative 1

It is noted that the driveway and the front porch are likely to require planning permission as they do not meet permitted development limitations. In order to regularise these additions, a planning application is required

3 Non Standard Informative 2

You are also informed that there are significant inaccuracies in the drawings both in respect to the existing elevation (windows position with respect to roof level) and with respect to the proposal, which means that it would not be possible to ascertain that the proposed alterations would be actually practicably achievable.

Authorising Officer:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Neil Goate', with a stylized, cursive script.

Neil Goate

27th June 2025