

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0797.25

WARD: Marshalls & Rise Pk **Date Received:** 13th June 2025

ADDRESS: 23 Links Avenue
Romford

PROPOSAL: Construction of a single storey front/side extension, the addition of a first floor with front and rear dormers, creation of loft space to include window to front with roof lights to rear and alterations to entrance and fenestration

DRAWING NO(S): 6185/03
6185/06
6185/05 A
6185/08

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 detached residential bungalow with a side garage and a rear extension. The property is not listed, nor is it within a conservation area. The surrounding area is residential in nature, containing mainly detached properties. There are various extensions in close proximity.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

The applicant is seeking planning consent for the construction of a single storey front / side extension, the addition of a first floor with front and rear dormers, the creation of loft space to include a window to the front with roof lights to rear and alterations to the entrance and fenestration.

RELEVANT HISTORY

None found.

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Letters were sent to the immediate neighbouring properties with two notifications of support.

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

- Section 6 Side extensions
- Section 7 Porches and front extensions
- Section 8 Roof alterations

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

This application is not CIL liable because the floor space created does not exceed 100 square metres.

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 extension to the existing side garage would be 2.8m in depth and within the existing front building line of the property. It would integrate well with the dwelling and would not appear out of place in the street scene.

The small changes to the fenestration would have minimal impact on the appearance of the house or the street scene.

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' and 'if the Council considers that a dormer facing the highway will not cause harm to the original house or street scene, its width should be no greater than 1.2 metres. The width should also not exceed the height (measured vertically between the highest and lowest points at which any part of the dormer intersects with the main roof). Where a larger window area is required on an elevation facing the highway, two smaller dormers with pitched roofs should be provided, suitably spaced apart, to minimise the apparent bulk of the additions. The combined width of a number of dormers on a roof facing the highway should not exceed half the width of the existing roof (measured at its mid-height)'.

The front dormer would have a width of 2.35m which exceeds the SPD guidance. However in this case a dormer of this width would not appear out of place as there are many front dormers nearby of a similar scale.

The increase in roof height by 2.5m to 8.8m would not appear prominent or out of place in the street scene and nearby buildings have a variety of roof heights. The roof would be hipped in to reduce the bulk. According to planning history there are the following roof heights nearby:

- no.11 is 8.5m in height.
- no.15 is 8.6m in height.
- no.19 is 9m in height.
- no.29 is 9.5m in height.
- no.31 is 8.7m in height.

With regards to the three rear dormers, although each one would be relatively small with 2.1 to 3m widths, they are positioned at eaves height rather than in the roof space and thus not considered to be unduly harmful. The single storey rear extension although slightly high with a parapet is considered to be acceptable given its depth and positioning adjacent to the outbuilding at no.21.

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 outlook.

The dwelling at no.25 is a bungalow and the extensions and resulting footprint would be within the front and rear building line of no.25 with no impact on their front and rear windows. There are secondary windows in the flank wall of no.25 serving a living room and a dining room (according to planning application P0558.13). It is acknowledged that less weight should be given on the impact on light to secondary habitable room windows but the living room to the rear of no.25 is long (around 8.4m) and the increased roof height would impact the amount of light entering this room. It is acknowledged also that the existing dwelling at the application site already impacts the light to these flank windows at no.25 but the situation will be made much worse which is not acceptable.

The dwelling at no.21 is a house and has a building line set in front of the application dwelling. The increased roof height of 2.5m, the increase in the eaves by 2m and the significant overall increase in the bulk and massing of the dwelling in such close proximity to the shared boundary would have an overbearing impact with an increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook from their rear private amenity space and rear habitable room windows to the detriment of the amenity enjoyed by the occupiers.

The small changes to the fenestration would have minimal impact on nearby amenity. Overlooking from the front and rear dormers and velux windows would have minimal impact in terms of overlooking.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

There are no highway issues. The extensions do not result in a loss of parking created so there are no highway reasons to refuse this application.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is considered to fail 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 Reason for refusal - Residential Extensions

The proposal would, by reason of its increased height, bulk and proximity to the shared boundary with the neighbouring dwelling at no.21, be an intrusive, overbearing and unneighbourly development that would have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of the adjacent occupiers resulting in an increased sense of enclosure, loss of outlook and an overbearing impact contrary to Policy 7 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.

Authorising Officer:



Neil Goate

29th August 2025