

## OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

**APPLICATION NO:** P0595.25

**WARD:** St Albans **Date Received:** 29th April 2025

**ADDRESS:** 15-17 Carlisle Road  
Romford

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of 2 x two storey, 2-bed semi-detached dwellings on land rear of 15 and 17 Carlisle Road following demolition of existing outbuildings with off street parking and amenities

**DRAWING NO(S):** CR-01  
CR-02  
CR-SP  
CR-03

**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 is an area currently used as rear gardens of 15 and 17 Carlisle Road in Romford and houses detached garages with access from Kings Grove.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential and is characterised by two storey terraced rows.

### **DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL**

Consent is sought for the construction of 2no. 2-storey houses to the rear of 15 and 17 Carlisle Road.

A planning application for a two storey, 2-bed detached dwelling on land rear of 17 Carlisle Road was refused and dismissed at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate. The refusal reasons were:

1. The proposed dwelling through its design, narrow, detached form, positioning and site layout would form an isolated, incongruous and visually cramped form of development at odds with surrounding character in an environment more familiar with subordinate outbuildings. The proposals would therefore be contrary to Policies 10, 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 and also Paragraph 130(a) of the NPPF which requires fundamentally that development add to the overall quality of the area whilst also establishing or maintaining a strong sense of place.
2. The proposed dwelling would form an intrusive and overbearing development with windows on

the boundary lines which would be detrimental to neighbouring amenity to the houses at 15 and 19 Carlisle Road and therefore contrary to Policies 10, 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031. There would also be conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.

3. The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate on site car parking provision for the host dwelling, result in unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity and contrary to Policies 23 & 24 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 and the Manual for Streets Document (March 2007).

The Planning Inspector dismissed the appeal by reason of refusal reason no.1 only.

## RELEVANT HISTORY

|          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| P0648.23 | Erection of a two storey, 2-bed detached dwelling on land rear of 17 Carlisle Road following demolition of existing garage with off street parking and amenities<br>Refuse 29-06-2023                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| W0200.22 | DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT<br><br>For Proposed new dwelling to<br>Rear of 17 Carlisle Road<br><br>COMPILED 09.11.2022<br><br>Design and Access<br>The proposals is to subdivide the rear garden of no17 Carlisle Road and to form a detached two bedroom property with own amenity space and off street parking. Access for both pedestrians and vehicle will be via Kings Grove where there is already a dropped kerb access to the road. The design also allows for the demolition of the properties garage. No client has pre paid allotted parking bay within Carlisle Road itself.<br><br>Design<br>The design will complement housing stock within Kings Grove in terms of bricks, tiles and roof finishes recently used within adjacent rear garden development at 5-11 Carlisle Road (land at rear) ref P1200.12. Internal space standards are achieved to the property along with above average internal storage.<br>Off street parking and provision of electric charging point included.<br>Separate refuse and recycling rubbish containers are to be built to the front along with 2 no covered secured bike stands.<br>Rear amenity space of 48m <sup>2</sup> is provided and the siting of the property is minimum 23m from donor property respecting privacy requirements.<br>Awaiting Decision |
| P1326.04 | Single storey rear extension                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |

|          |                              |            |
|----------|------------------------------|------------|
|          | Apprv with cons              | 10-09-2004 |
| P1051.04 | Single storey rear extension |            |
|          | Refuse                       | 05-07-2004 |
| P0379.04 | Single storey rear extension |            |
|          | Refuse                       | 26-04-2004 |

## CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbouring occupiers were consulted through direct notification with objections from seven neighbours received and the application has also been 'called-in' by a local Councillor to request that the application is heard at Planning Committee if recommended for approval. The comments are summarised below:

- Overlooking, loss of light, intrusive and overbearing.
- Devalue nearby properties.
- Traffic and parking issues.
- Impact on access for emergency vehicles.
- Overdevelopment, overpopulation.
- Loss of large tree on the site.
- Very narrow site.
- An application already refused on the site.
- The garage has asbestos.

Officer response:

Some matters raised are not material planning considerations. Loss of amenity, design, impact on the street scene and parking are considered by the planning system.

In addition the following comments were made by other stakeholders:

- Highway Authority - no comments received.
- Public Protection - No objection subject to conditions.
- Waste/Recycling (Streetcare) - No objection.
- Fire Brigade (Hydrants) - No objection.

## RELEVANT POLICIES

- Achieving sustainable development
- 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
- 11 - Making effective use of land
- 12 - Achieving well-designed places
- 13 - Protecting Green Belt land
- 14 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

The adopted planning policies;  
Policy 7 Residential design and amenity  
Policy 10 Garden and Backland Development  
Policy 23 Transport Connections  
Policy 24 Parking provision and design  
Policy 26 Urban design  
Policy 27 Landscaping  
Policy 30 Biodiversity and geodiversity  
Policy 33 Air quality

Other relevant development plans includes;

The London Plan (2021) where the relevant policies include;

D1 (London's form, character and capacity for growth),  
D4 (Delivering good design),  
D6 (Housing quality and standards),  
H1 (Increasing housing supply),  
H10 (Housing size mix),  
T5 (Cycling),  
T6 (Car parking) and

DCLG Technical Housing Standards document is relevant  
Manual for Streets March 2007

The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF) is a material planning consideration. The relevant chapters with respect to the pre application schemes;

2 - Achieving sustainable development  
5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes  
9 - Promoting sustainable transport  
11 - Making effective use of land  
12 - Achieving well-designed places  
15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

## **MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS**

Contributions would be required under CIL regulations. The proposal would result in a net increase of 140.4m<sup>2</sup>.

This would translate to a Mayoral CIL (MCIL2) contribution of £3510 /(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 £17,550.

Each contribution would be subject to indexation.

## STAFF COMMENTS

The material planning considerations are the principle of the development, density and site layout, design and impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, impact on amenity, highways and parking and planning obligations.

## PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The National Planning Policy Framework states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The London Plan notes the pressing need for housing and the general requirement to improve housing choice, affordability and quality accommodation. The provision of additional accommodation is consistent with the NPPF and the objectives of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 which at Policy 3 is supportive of housing provision in sustainable locations. In addition the London Plan 2021 notes the pressing need for housing and the general requirement to improve housing choice, affordability and quality at Policy H1 whilst also acknowledging that development should optimise housing output subject to local context and character at Policy D1.

The acceptability of any submission is reliant on other policy considerations including Policy 10 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 which requires consideration of the following:

Proposals for residential development on garden and back-land sites in Havering will be supported when they:

- i. Ensure good access and, where possible, retain existing through routes;
- ii. Retain and provide adequate amenity space for existing and new dwellings;
- iii. Do not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of existing and new occupants;
- iv. Do not prejudice the future development of neighbouring sites;
- v. Do not result in significant adverse impacts on green infrastructure and biodiversity that cannot be effectively mitigated and;
- vi. Within the Hall Lane and Emerson Park Character Areas as designated on the Proposals Map, the subdivision of plots and garden development will not be supported, unless it can be robustly demonstrated that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character of the area and that the proposed plot sizes are consistent with the size, setting and arrangement of properties in the surrounding area.

In addition to the above the Housing Delivery Test results are a material consideration. On the 12th December 2024, the Government published the Housing Delivery Test result for 2023. The Housing Delivery Test Result for Havering for 2023 is 61%. In accordance with the NPPF the "Presumption" due to housing delivery therefore applies.

In terms of housing supply, based on the latest 2024 Housing Trajectory, Havering is able to demonstrate 3.4 years supply of deliverable housing sites. The Havering Local Plan was found sound and adopted in 2021 in the absence of a five year land supply. The Inspector's report concluded:

"85. Ordinarily, the demonstration of a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land is a prerequisite of a sound plan in terms of the need to deliver a wide choice of homes. However, in the circumstances

of this Plan, where the housing requirement has increased at a late stage in the examination, I ultimately conclude that the Plan, as proposed to be modified, is sound in this regard subject to an immediate review.

86. This is a pragmatic approach which is consistent with the findings of the Dacorum judgement. It aims to ensure that an adopted plan is put in place in the interim period before the update is adopted and the 5-year housing land supply situation is established."

The Council is committed to an update of the Local Plan and this is set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme. Therefore, in the meantime whilst the position with regard to housing supply is uncertain, the "Presumption" due to housing supply is applied. The Presumption refers to the tilted balance set out in Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF as if the presumption in favour of sustainable development outlined in paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been engaged.

Para 11(d) states that where the policies which are most important for determining the proposal are out of date, permission should be granted unless (i) the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a strong reason for refusing the development, or (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Fundamentally this means that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

The proposed development would offer a small contribution to housing supply and delivery and this would weigh in favour of the development. For the reasons outlined within the officers report the proposed development is unacceptable and the proposal does not benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF.

## **DENSITY/SITE LAYOUT**

Policy D6 (Housing Quality and Standards) of the London Plan advises that housing development should be of high quality design and provide adequately-sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts which are fit for purpose and meet the needs of Londoners without differentiating between tenures. To that end the policy requires that new residential development conform to minimum internal space standards. There are set requirements for gross internal floor areas of new dwellings at a defined level of occupancy as well as floor areas and dimensions for key parts of the home, notably bedrooms, storage and minimum floor to ceiling heights. The minimum gross internal floor area requirements and room sizes takes into account commonly required furniture and the spaces needed for different activities and moving around. New dwellings must also demonstrate an acceptable arrangement of private amenity space. The Adopted Residential Design SPD states that private amenity space should be provided in single, high quality, usable, enclosed blocks which benefit from both natural sunlight and shading. The Residential Design SPD does not prescribe fixed standards for private amenity space, which can be restrictive on small and awkward sites. The London Plan (2021) offers guidance on this matter in the sense that minimum standards are present in Policy D6. It states that where there are no higher local standards in the borough Development Plan Documents, a minimum of 5 sqm. of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1 sqm. should be provided for each additional occupant, and it must achieve

a minimum depth and width of 1.5m.

Having applied the standards to the proposal, the new dwellings would meet the required gross internal floor area of 70 square metres for a two storey 2-bedroom / 3 person dwelling based on the size of each of the dwellings shown (70.2 square metres). Policy D6 of the London Plan states that a dwelling with two or more bed-spaces must have at least one double (or twin) bedroom that is at least 2.75m wide. Every other additional double (or twin) bedroom must be at least 2.55m wide. This is met and the bedroom sizes meet standards. The internal ceiling heights are shown on the plans and the 2.5m ceiling height standard is met. The properties would be dual aspect. Private amenity space for the new dwellings and the host dwellings would be of a suitable size.

The character impacts are explored below.

## **DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE**

The Council recognises that much of the borough is suburban, characterised by spaciouly set up neighbourhoods with large private gardens. Intensification of these areas by development on gardens or back-land may provide valuable sources for housing. Development of such sites can be difficult as there are often a number of constraints. They require sensitive development and high quality design to ensure that the character of the area and the quality of life of existing and future residents is maintained.

Policy 10 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (HLP) is relevant as it states that the subdivision of plots and garden development will not be supported, unless it can be robustly demonstrated that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character of the area and that the proposed plot sizes are consistent with the size, setting and arrangement of properties in the surrounding area. Policy 10 would need to be taken in conjunction with Policies 7 and 26 of the HLP which require fundamentally that residential development be of high quality design. Therefore compliance with the criteria of Policy 10 as set out in the preceding section of this report is not of itself justification for approval.

The Framework states that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. It goes on to set out that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, in so far as that it creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. However an overarching consideration is the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), of promoting regeneration and change; and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places. The framework requires that permission is refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

The prevailing pattern of development in term of housing typology in the area is terraced housing with detached garages to the rear. Development behind the site at King Grove is a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached housing. The proposal would result in the change of the appearance of the site from a row of detached single storey outbuildings to a pair of narrow, 2-storey detached dwellings in the middle of existing outbuildings. It is acknowledged that there has been some development of gardens in Carlisle Road to provide new dwellings, including a row of 4 terraced houses to the east of the site behind 5 to 11 Carlisle Road which are now known as 11-14 Kings

Grove (planning reference: P1875.10). However the construction of a pair of narrow (4m in width each) 'stand-alone' dwellings which would be further forward than the building line of 11-14 Kings Grove and fail to reflect the nearby design would look out of place in the street-scene and would set an unacceptable precedent to piecemeal houses that do not relate to others nearby. The dwellings would form an incongruous feature in the street-scene and would be conspicuous through their narrow form and fail to take into account the character of the rest of the terraced row or the street scene generally. The close proximity of the development to the shared boundaries and relative bulk, scale and positioning would present as visually cramped within the narrow site. Accordingly it would not respond to the local patterns of development and in the context of Policy 10 would not be consistent with the size, setting and arrangement of properties in the surrounding area.

The National Planning Policy Framework promotes and supports the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained. The benefits of this would however need to outweigh the other potential harm arising. The provision of accommodation with the layout shown could be regarded as being at odds with the established urban grain and detrimental to local character. As such there would be conflict with the objectives of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031, specifically Policies 7 and 26, as well as the NPPF and London Plan 2021.

## **IMPACT ON AMENITY**

Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (HLP) states that planning permission will not be granted where the proposal results in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/ daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy, noise, vibration and disturbance to existing and future residents. This policy is to be read in conjunction with Policy 26 however the objectives are reflected in Policy 34 also which states that development will not be permitted where it would unduly impact upon amenity, human health and safety and the natural environment by noise, dust, odour and light pollution, vibration and land contamination.

In the refused application (reference: P0648.23), one of the reasons for refusal was the impact on amenity of adjoining dwellings by reason of the presence of 6 windows in the flank walls of the new dwelling (3 on the ground floor and 3 on the first floor) right on boundaries with no.15 and no.19 Carlisle Road. This current application has no windows in the flank walls so this refusal reason would no longer be applicable.

With regards to loss of light and overshadowing, it is reasonable to assert through the massing of the development that there would be some level of overshadowing to the rear garden and first floor windows of the host plot at the existing house at no.17 and the adjoining neighbours. However it is not considered that these impacts would be material in planning terms. There would be spacing of approximately 23m from the host dwelling and the new dwelling. Also, overlooking from the rear windows of the new dwelling back to the host plot at the existing house at no.17 and the adjoining neighbours would be of an acceptable level, mitigated by the 23m spacing. There are new dwellings nearby at 11-14 Kings Grove which were approved in planning application P1875.10 which used the rear gardens of 5-11 Carlisle Road, so it would be unreasonable to refuse this application due to loss of light, overshadowing and loss of privacy when the precedent has been set nearby.

In terms of the impact on the properties to the rear of the site at Kings Grove, there would be



minimal impact in terms of loss of light, overshadowing or overlooking. The windows of the dwelling on this elevation would not directly overlook dwellings at Kings Grove but it would face parking / garages. The nearest dwellings at 1 & 2 Kings Grove would be over 12m away across the road, so little impact in terms of loss of light or overshadowing. It would be difficult to refuse this application on loss of amenity to properties at Kings Grove.

The Inspector wrote in the appeal decision for the refused application that the proposed development would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and this view is relevant with regards to this current application too.

## **HIGHWAY/PARKING**

Parking provision and matters of highway consideration are represented in Policies 23 and 24 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031. The PTAL rating for the site is 2; in such locations in outer London the London Plan at Policy T6 requires 0.75 spaces per new dwelling which is met with one adequately sized car parking space per dwelling shown on the plans.

On paper, there would be a loss of parking for the donor property due to the demolition of the detached rear garage. The Inspector wrote in the appeal decision for the refused application that there would, in practice, be no loss of parking for the host dwelling as the existing garage is of an inadequate size to accommodate a vehicle and the entrance is overgrown and has clearly not been used for vehicle parking for some time. With this in mind, it would be difficult to refuse this current application on highway or parking grounds.

## **TREES**

It would appear that there is a mature tree at the far end of the garden which would need to be removed

The tree is not protected however, the loss of trees conflicts with Local Policies which require development to protect and conserve the natural environment and its assets. The loss of trees also contradicts the London Plan policies which it specifically requires that existing trees of value should be retained and any loss as the result of development should be replaced following the principle of 'right place, right tree'. It also fails to meet the objectives of Government policy in Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework which says local planning authorities should refuse planning permission for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including veteran or aged trees.

Further, chapter 15 of the NPPF deals with the Conserving and enhancing the natural environment. At paragraph 170, it explains that the planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other matters, protecting sites of biodiversity value and minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity

At paragraph, 175, the NPPF explains that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply principles that include that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be

refused.

There are similar policies with regards to the protection, conservation and the enhancement of the wild life, and in the adopted London Plan and the Local plan. These policies together seek to protect and enhance the nature conservation.

The application is largely silent with respect to the loss of tree and general garden environment. The loss of tree and impact upon biodiversity of site is regretted. However, the tree is not protected and it might be possible that if the planning permission were to be granted, to incorporate mitigating measures to address the loss of tree and enhance biodiversity.

## KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposed development would offer a modest contribution to housing supply and delivery and this would weigh in favour of the development. However, paragraphs 124-131 of the NPPF require high quality design, consideration of character and a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. For the reasons outlined within the officers report the proposed development is unacceptable.

The adverse impacts identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole. Therefore, the proposal does not benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF. Having had regard to the above and in doing so all relevant planning policy and material considerations, REFUSAL is recommended accordingly.

## RECOMMENDATION:

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

### 1 Refusal non standard

The proposed dwellings through their design, positioning and site layout would form an isolated, incongruous and visually cramped form of development at odds with surrounding character in an environment more familiar with subordinate outbuildings. The proposals would therefore be contrary to Policies 10, 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 and also Paragraph 130(a) of the NPPF which requires fundamentally that development add to the overall quality of the area whilst also establishing or maintaining a strong sense of place.

## 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 Refusal and CIL

In the event that this application is allowed through the appeals process the proposals would be liable for the following CIL contributions:

Mayoral CIL (MCIL2) contribution of £3510 (x £25 per sqm).

Havering CIL (HCIL) contribution of £17,550 (x £125 per sqm)

Each contribution would be subject to indexation.

**Authorising Officer:**



Neil Goate

15th July 2025