OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0974.25

WARD: Cranham **Date Received:** 22nd July 2025

ADDRESS: 113 Moor Lane
Upminster

PROPOSAL: Part single, part two storey front, side, rear extensions and hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and roof lights to front

DRAWING NO(S): 101
201

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 comprises of a two storey detached dwelling finished in painted render and garden area. Parking on the drive and in the garage to the front of the property. The surrounding area is characterised by single and two storey dwellings of various styles and designs.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for part single, part two storey front, side, rear extensions and hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and roof lights to front.

The works have already been commenced on site.

RELEVANT HISTORY

ES/HOR 811/57 - Bedroom over garage - Approved.
L/HAV 957/66 - Carport.
L/HAV 349/67 - Porch, verandah & carport - Approved.
L/HAV 326/67 - Enlargement of bedroom - Approved.

P0694.25	Single-storey rear infill extension	
	Withdrawn	03-07-2025
P0531.25	Double storey side extension	
	Withdrawn	03-07-2025
P0082.25	Side extension	
	Apprv with cons	18-03-2025

P0025.25	Single storey rear extension	
	Apprv with cons	07-03-2025
D0003.25	Certificate of Lawfulness for a hip-to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and roof lights to front	
	PP not required	09-04-2025
P1704.24	Part two storey part single storey front/ side extension.	
	Apprv with cons	31-01-2025
Y0303.24	Single storey rear extension with an overall depth of 6m, a maximum height of 3.20m, and an eaves height of 3m. (PRIOR APPROVAL)	
	Pr App Ref Val	06-01-2025
P0970.95	Single storey side extension	
	Apprv with cons	11-10-1995

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

No representations were received in response to the neighbour notification.

RELEVANT POLICIES

- For ease of reference, the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD will be referred as "SPD".

LONDON PLAN:
Policy D1 London's form, character and capacity for growth
Policy D4 Delivering good design
Policy T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
Policy T6 Car parking

Havering Local Plan (2016-2031)
Policy 7 (Residential design and amenity).
Policy 24 (Parking provision and design).
Policy 26 (Urban Design).

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The Havering and London Mayoral CIL payment is applicable as the proposal is for a extended dwelling and creates more than 100 square metres of additional floorspace. The gross internal floor area of the existing dwelling is 126.68 square metres and this can be deducted from the gross internal floor area of the extended dwelling. The dwelling would have a total of area of 238.03 square metres once extended. The difference equates to 111.35 square metres which is rounded up to 112 square metres.

The Mayoral CIL has a charging rate of £25 per square metre of net additional floor space of the proposed development and therefore the liability equals 112 x £25 per sq.m = £2,800.

The Havering CIL has been implemented which has a charging rate of £125 per square metre of net additional floor space of the proposed development in Zone A.

The proposal would be liable for Havering Community Infrastructure Levy contributions of CIL of £14,000 (112 x £125) to mitigate the impact of the development.

The total CIL liability to be paid is £16,800 plus indexiation.

STAFF COMMENTS

In accordance with the current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not undertaken. Photos were provided used from another application submitted to the Local Planning Authority and also in determining this planning application, Google StreetView TM, aerial view images and submitted drawings were used to assess the site constraints.

It is noted that works have commenced on site. This application is an amalgamation of P1704.24, D0003.25, P0025.25 and P0082.25. It noted that two further applications were withdrawn P0531.25 & P0694.25 which were for larger extensions of P0025.25 and P0082.25.

Following the Planning Officer's site visit is was noted that the proposal was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

It should be noted that no pre-application advice was sought prior to undertaking the unauthorised works and it is considered that the changes required to try and bring the proposal within the realms of acceptability would not be minor.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The application site is located on the junction of Moor Lane and Kings Gardens, Upminster.

No objection are raised to the proposed addition of the roof lights from a visual point of view.

The SPD outlines that:

"Roof extensions and alterations can change the appearance and character of the dwelling, particularly when alterations are made to the front elevation. Proposals to convert a hipped roof to a gable end roof to one house on a pair of semi-detached dwellings can result in unbalancing the pair. Where the Council has control over such proposals and hipped roofs form a characteristic of the house and/or street, a gable end will not be considered acceptable".

The application dwelling is a detached property within a street of single and storey dwellings. A certificate of lawfulness was granted under application D0003.25 which was for a "Certificate of Lawfulness for a hip-to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and roof lights to front",

The proposal was in fact for a double hip to gable as was shown on the certificate application. This part of the proposal was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans, the cheeks of the

dormer have been built in line with the gable ends on either side and constructed in face brick instead of being set in from the gable end on either side and being tile hung. At the time of the site visit, zinc cladding was also used on the face of the rear dormer window instead of it being tile hung and therefore the proposal was not in accordance with the approved Certificate of Lawfulness or with permitted development guidelines and the information with the MHCLG Permitted development rights for householders Technical Guidance September 2019.

Concerns were raised regarding the zinc cladding and the plans submitted as part of this application indicates that the face of the dormer will be now be tile hung.

This application has been submitted to seek regularise the works on site. The application wishes to retain a gabled roof property and rear dormer window. The impact of the loft conversion has been exacerbated by the large rear dormer window which extends of the gable end on either side and the cheeks of the dormer have been finished in face brick which adds significant scale and bulk to the application dwelling.

The application site is located on a prominent junction and the development would be visible from the street and the rear garden environment and from the neighbouring rear gardens. It is considered that the scale and bulk of the loft conversion including the double hip to gable roof alteration and rear dormer window would dominate the surrounding area as it is out of scale, disproportionately large, overly prominent and relates unacceptably to the existing dwelling. This is particularly the case because the dormer has been built across the almost entirety of the extended roofscape of the original dwelling and off the flank walls. It is judged that this part of the proposal would be overbearing and visually intrusive.

The SPD outlines that "the character of many streets in the borough is derived from the uniform spacing of dwellings. Side extensions should be carefully designed so they do not interrupt this rhythm and do not detract from Havering's open and spacious character" and 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 proposed two storey side extensions on either side of the dwelling would be set back from the front elevations of the application dwelling. It is considered that the two storey side extensions as proposed would not be unacceptable. However, a parapet detail has been added to the front, side and rear of the two storey side extension approved as part of P1704.24 adjacent to No.111 Moor Lane which adds further bulk when viewed in conjunction with the unauthorised loft extension.

The pre-existing flat roof two storey rear extension/projection was demolished during construction and no planning consent was obtained to re-build it and this has also been included in this application. The proposal now includes a ground floor rear extension which would be 6m deep. Works for this 6m deep had commenced on site eventhough no planning consent was given and following a prior application Y0303.24 being refused as validation as the proposal was "not permitted development due to the proposed extension being more than half the width of the original dwelling (where there is a staggered original rear wall or where the proposal extends beyond the rear wall). Even with the intent to demolish the furthest forward rear wall, case law advises that the 'original' rear wall is the element to be taken into consideration at the time of validation".

The 6m deep ground floor rear extension required planning consent but works commenced without this being received.

The SPD outlines that rear extensions should be carefully designed in order to minimise their bulk. 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.

The proposed first floor rear extension would be contrary to this guidance as it would be finished with a flat roof, however, it would be replacing an existing flat roof first floor rear extension.

The proposed flat roof single storey and first floor rear extension would be of an acceptable design. No objections are raised in principle to this part of the proposal in isolation.

However, there are concerns regarding the cumulative impact of the multiple applications submitted outlined within the history. The proposal approved have not bee constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

The cumulative impact of the gabling of the roof of the subject property with the addition of the large rear dormer window and parapet detail with the back drop of the other single and two storey side and rear extensions on this prominent junction which is clearly visible from the street and rear garden environment would add considerably to bulk and mass at roof level and would appear at odds with the cohesive appearance of the remainder of the properties, and out of character within surrounding area. Such an approach is not in keeping with the design of the original dwelling.

The NPPF outlines that development within paragraph 135-139 should be sympathetic to the character and establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

It is considered that the cumulative impact of the part single, part two storey front, side, rear extensions, hip to gable loft conversion and large rear dormer window to be retained would by reason its combined scale, bulk and mass on the roof alteration be unduly prominent and detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and rear garden environment contrary to Policy 26 of the Local Plan 2021, the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2011), Policy D4 of the London Plan and also the guidance within the NPPF.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Consideration has been given to the impact of the proposal on the side properties, primarily in respect of privacy and overshadowing.

It is considered that the proposal would be well removed from the other neighbours to north, east and west of the site so they would not be unacceptably impacted from the proposal due to the separation distance between them.

No.111 Moor Lane would be the neighbour most affected by the development. The position of the neighbouring dwelling at No.11 would mitigate the impact of the proposal in part particularly the two storey side extension, loft conversion and the ground floor rear extension as proposed.

The two storey side and first floor extension would be located on the north east side of the dwelling. It is not envisaged that this part of the proposal would have any impact on the amenity of the neighbours at No.111 Moor Lane as they are located to the south west and the proposal would be

located on the opposite side of the dwelling and the separation distance would mitigate the impact of this proposal.

Furthermore, the flank windows on the two storey side extension on the north side of the dwelling would face the street, which is a public area, as such it is not envisaged that there would be any loss of privacy from this development.

It is considered that the proposal would not result in any undue overlooking or loss of privacy above existing conditions, particularly as the first floor windows of the application dwelling and the neighbouring properties already overlook the rear garden areas of surrounding residential properties.

The height of the ground floor rear extension at 3m excluding the roof light complies with Council, however, the overall depth at 6m would be greater than the 4m normally permissible under current guidelines prescribed within the SPD.

The overall projection beyond No.111's rear elevation is not unusual and is envisaged within guidelines as acceptable when considering the impact of a 4m deep extension on the boundary with a neighbour that has not previously extended.

The proposed roof lights on top of the extension would be sufficiently removed from the sides of the extension, not to unacceptably impact on the adjacent neighbours.

Should the application be approved, to safeguard the privacy of the adjoining neighbours, two conditions have been imposed to ensure that no openings will be added to side of the proposed extensions or that the flat roof of the rear extension would not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area, unless specific permission is obtained is writing from the Local Planning Authority.

Given these circumstances and mindful of the general presumption in favour of development, it is considered any impact upon this neighbour to be modest and within that envisaged as acceptable within guidelines.

In all, the development is considered to fall within the spirit of adopted guidelines for householder extensions and the proposal is not deemed to be unneighbourly.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The application site is within a PTAL area of 1b. As per Policy 24 the Havering Local Plan with a PTAL of 0 - 1 that has 3 bedrooms, the site needs to provide a minimum parking provision of up to 1.5 spaces per dwelling, which is rounded up to two spaces.

Photographic evidence shows that two parking space can be provided and therefore no objections are raised to the existing parking from a highways/parking point of view.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

However, for the reasons outlined above, it is considered the proposal is considered to be contrary to the above-mentioned policies and guidance and a refusal is recommended

RECOMMENDATION:

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

1 Reason for refusal - Streetscene & rear garden environment

The cumulative impact of the part single, part two storey front, side, rear extensions, hip to gable loft conversion and large rear dormer window to be retained would by reason its combined scale, bulk and mass on the roof alteration be unduly prominent and detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and rear garden environment contrary to Policy 26 of the Local Plan 2021, the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2011), Policy D4 of the London Plan and also the guidance within the NPPF.

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, notification of intended refusal and the reason(s) for it was given to Mr Satka (Agent) by e-mail on 17/09/25.

2 CIL informative for refused proposal - Residential

For Residential Development Only

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 of £16,800 plus indexation in Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This charge has been levied under s.206 of the Planning Act 2008 and includes both the Mayor of London's CIL and Havering Council's CIL.

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 a CIL Liability Notice indicating a levy of £16,800 plus indexation for the application, based on the Mayoral CIL levy rate for Havering of £25/sq.m plus Havering's charging rate for residential of £125/sq.m (Zone A) and the floorspace of 112 square metres. 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:

Habib Neshat 18th September 2025

Habib Neshat