

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0796.25

WARD: Mawneys **Date Received:** 13th June 2025

ADDRESS: 1 Elm Close
Romford

PROPOSAL: Part single, part two storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration

DRAWING NO(S): N.A/1EC/101 ISSUE A
N.A/1EC/102 ISSUE B
N.A/1EC/103 ISSUE C
N.A/1EC/104 ISSUE C
N.A/1EC/105 ISSUE C
N.A/1EC/106 ISSUE A
N.A/1EC/107 ISSUE C
N.A/1EC/108 ISSUE A
N.A/1EC/109 ISSUE A
N.A/1EC/110

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the condition(s) given at the end of the report

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is occupied by a two storey semi-detached property which is finished in painted render. The application site is located within Elm Close. At the front of the site is a driveway for off street parking and at the rear is a spacious garden. The surrounding area is characterised by two storey terraced and semi-detached residential dwellings.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a part single, part two storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration.

A ground and first floor flank window are proposed on the original wall of the dwelling house which can normally be added under permitted development.

RELEVANT HISTORY

Y0158.25

Single storey rear extension with an overall depth of 4m, a maximum height of 3m, and an eaves height of 3m. (PRIOR APPROVAL)

Pr App Not Req'd

02-07-2025

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

No representations were received from neighbouring residents in response to consultation.

RELEVANT POLICIES

Havering Local Plan (adopted 2021)

Policy 7 - Residential Design and Amenity

Policy 10 - Garden and backland development

Policy 24 - Parking provision and design

Policy 26 - Urban Design

The London Plan (2021)

Policy D1 - London's form, character and capacity for growth

Policy D4 - Delivering good design

Policy T6 - Car parking

OTHER

National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2024)

Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2011)

LDF

SPD04 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The application is not CIL liable.

STAFF COMMENTS

In accordance with the current criteria for site visits, an in-person site visit was not undertaken. Site photos were provided by the agent in support of the application. In determining this planning application photos, Google StreetView TM, aerial view images and submitted drawings were used to assess the site constraints.

Revised plans were received during the course of the application, reducing the depth of the first floor rear extension from 3.5m to 3m in depth, altering the pitch of the first floor extension roof as it was not the same as application dwelling. Also, clarification was sought on the width of the ground

floor flank window as there was a discrepancy between the floor plans & elevations. Neighbours were not re-consulted as the revised plans were sought for clarity.

Planning Officer clarified the intended use of property and agent advised via e-mail on 18th September 2025 that it would be as a residential dwelling.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

No objection are raised to the proposed ground and first floor flank windows from a visual point of view. These windows can normally be added under permitted development.

The proposed single storey rear extension with part first floor rear extension would be mainly visible from the rear garden environment, however, there would be views from the street when entering Elm Close from Elm Road.

The proposed ground and first floor rear extensions would have a depth of the 3.5m and 3m respectively as revised which complies with the guidance within the SPD. The ground floor rear extension would be finished with a flat roof and the first floor rear would be finished with a hip roof to comply with guidance.

The width of the floor rear extension would be 5m wide and it is noted that the width of the application dwelling is 8.275m as indicated on drawing N.A/1EC/102 ISSUE B. The first floor rear extension would be approximately 60 per cent of the width of the original dwelling which is considered to be within the realms of acceptability, mindful of the width of the application dwelling.

It is considered that the proposed development would be of an acceptable design and will relate well with the existing dwelling and therefore no objections are raised from a visual point of view.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Consideration has been given to the impact on the neighbouring dwelling in terms of loss of light and loss of privacy.

It is considered that the proposal would be well removed from the other neighbours on Orchard Road and Argus Close so they would not be unacceptably impacted from the proposal due to the separation distance between them.

It is proposed to add a ground and first floor flank window within the original wall of the dwelling house as shown on drawings N.A/1EC/101 ISSUE A, N.A/1EC/102 ISSUE B & N.A/1EC/105 ISSUE C.

Drawing N.A/1EC/105 ISSUE C indicates that the first floor windows will be obscured glazed and openable above 1.7m which would be in line with permitted development guidelines. From a design point of view, obscure glazing bedroom windows are not ideal, however, this has been put forward as part of the proposal and to ensure there is no loss of privacy to the neighbours on Orchard Road. A condition would be imposed to ensure that this is retained and to protect neighbouring privacy.

Photography from the site, show that there is a close boarded fence and vegetation along the boundary which would screen views from the ground floor flank window into the neighbouring garden within Orchard Road.

No.2 Elm Close would be the neighbour most affected by the development. The depth and height at 3.5m and 3m respectively of the ground floor rear extension complies with Council guidelines outlined within the SPD and in fact the depth of the ground floor rear extension would be less than the 4m normally permissible.

Furthermore, the depth of first floor rear extension has been reduced from 3.5m to 3m to comply with guidance. The proposed first floor rear extension would be set off the common boundary with the properties on Orchard Road by 1.3m and by 3.275m from the boundary with No.2 Elm Close.

Although, the gap adjacent to the properties on Orchard Road would be less than 2m, it would be well removed from the rear elevation of these neighbouring dwellings so not to impact on their amenity.

It is noted the proposed first floor rear extension would not infringe upon a notional line taken from common boundary with No.2 Elm Close at first floor level created by a 2m separation distance and the 3m depth of the extension, this is due to the separation distance between the boundary and the extension.

Taking the above in consideration, it is considered that the proposed development would not unacceptably impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbours.

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

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 on the rear elevation of the application dwelling and the neighbouring properties already overlook the rear garden areas of surrounding residential properties.

To safeguard the privacy of the adjoining neighbours, two conditions would be imposed should the application be recommended for approval 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 in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

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 proposal would unalter the existing parking arrangement and therefore no parking or highways implications would arise as a result of the proposal.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is considered to be in accordance with the above-mentioned policies and guidance and approval is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that **planning permission be GRANTED** subject to the following condition(s)

1 SC4 (Time limit) 3yrs

The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:-

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2 SC10 (Matching materials)

All new external finishes shall be carried out in materials to match those of the existing building(s) to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area.

3 SC32 (Accordance with plans)

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).

Reason:-

For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out as approved.

4 SC34B (Obscure with fanlight openings only)

The proposed first floor flank window as shown on drawing N.A/1EC/102 ISSUE B & N.A/1EC/105 ISSUE C shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass not less than level 4 on the standard scale of obscurity and shall thereafter be maintained and permanently fixed shut and thereafter maintained, with the exception of any top hung fanlight(s).

Reason:-

In the interests of privacy.

5 SC46 (Standard flank window condition)

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted

Development) (England) Order 2015, no window or other opening (other than those shown on the submitted and approved plan,) shall be formed in the flank wall(s) of the building(s) hereby permitted, unless specific permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In order to ensure a satisfactory development that will not result in any loss of privacy or damage to the environment of neighbouring properties which exist or may be proposed in the future.

6 SC48 (Balcony condition)

The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:-

In the interests of the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring dwelling.

INFORMATIVES

1 Land Ownership Informative Land Ownership Informative

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not give consent for any part of the development including guttering and fascias to encroach onto any land not within the applicant's ownership.

2 Approval following revision

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework, improvements required to make the proposal acceptable were negotiated with Smart Skills Limited by e-mail and phone. The revisions involved reducing the depth of the first floor rear extension from 3.5m to 3m in depth, altering the pitch of the first floor extension roof as it was not the same as application dwelling. Also, clarification was sought on the width of the ground floor flank window as there was a discrepancy between the floor plans & elevations. Neighbours were not re-consulted as the revised plans were sought for clarity. The amendments were subsequently submitted on 26/08/25, 15/09/25 & 18/09/25.

Authorising Officer:



Neil Goate

19th September 2025