

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P1156.25

WARD: Cranham **Date Received:** 4th September 2025

ADDRESS: 54 Courtenay Gardens
Upminster

PROPOSAL: Single storey rear/side extension with flat roof, roof lights and steps to rear, involving demolition of existing detached garage to side

DRAWING NO(S): EX02 A
EX03
P01
P02 A

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 features a two storey semi-detached residential dwellinghouse. Situated in the Hall Lane Policy Area (Zone B), it benefits from a loft conversion which includes a hip-to-gable, rear dormer and front roof lights. A key feature of the site and other properties along the eastern side of the road is the significant drop in ground level within the back garden towards the rear of the site. The dwelling is not listed nor is located within a conservation area.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear/side extension with flat roof, roof lights and steps to rear, involving demolition of existing detached garage to side.

1. The proposed extension would project beyond the side and rear of the dwellinghouse up to 8m in depth at its maximum point. It would benefit from a small patio with steps down into the back garden. The steps would measure approximately 1.5m high. The extension would measure 4m high from the top of the proposed patio area and would also be set back from the front of the dwelling by about 60cm.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P1566.22	Retrospective application for hip to gable loft extension with rear dormer and front roof lights
	Apprv with cons 29-11-2022

ENF/402/22	Without the benefit of planning permission, alterations to the main roof including the construction of a dormer windows in the rear roof elevation.	
P0666.22	Single storey rear/side extension with flat roof, two rooflights and new patio to rear, involving demolition of existing detached garage to side	
	Refuse	25-01-2023
D0446.19	Certificate of Lawfulness for a proposed hip to gable loft extension with rear dormer and 3No.front roof light windows.	
	PP not required	06-01-2020

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Surrounding neighbouring occupiers, including ones directly adjoining the application site, were consulted about this application. The representations received can be summarised as follows:

- Height, proximity and materials of proposal would be oppressive
- Removal of hedge and tree would be against Council's climate policy and impact wildlife and birds
- Impacts on character of Hall Lane area setting
- Extension would be disproportionate
- Light pollution from extension

RELEVANT POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework

Havering Local Plan

- * Policy 7 - Residential design and amenity
- * Policy 24 - Car Parking
- * Policy 26 - Urban design

London Plan (2021)

- * Policy D1 - London's form, character and capacity for growth
- * Policy D4 - Delivering good design
- * Policy T6 - Car parking

Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD)

Hall Lane Policy Area (HPLA) Supplementary Planning Document

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

This application is not CIL liable because the newly created floorspace would not exceed 100 square metres.

STAFF COMMENTS

An in-person site visit was not undertaken by the case officer during the application process as one was not considered to be necessary. Site photographs were received from the planning agent. In assessing this application, photographs, Google street view, aerial images and the submitted drawings were used to assess the site, its constraints and the developments subject of the application.

This application is a resubmission of a previously refused planning application P0666.22. The key issue in this case therefore is whether the revised proposal overcomes the previously stated concerns. The previous application was refused planning permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposed developments would, by reason of the cumulative impact of their bulk, mass, height and proximity to the neighbouring boundary with no. 52 Courtenay Gardens, appear over-dominant in the rear garden scene and be an intrusive and overbearing form of development in relation to this neighbour, resulting in an adverse impact on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, contrary to Local Plan Policies 7 and 26.

This application differs from the previously refused scheme in the following key areas:

1. Whereas the previously refused side/rear extension projected approximately 6.9m deep at its maximum point from the rear of the dwellinghouse and also had an I-shaped raised patio projecting up to approximately 5m deep at its maximum point from back of the extension, the revised extension proposed under this application would project approximately 8m deep at its maximum point. The extension would now project approximately 2.8m beyond the rear of the unattached neighbour instead of approximately 3.8m under the previous scheme. The height of the extension closest to the unattached boundary has reduced from 4m to 3.5m. The height of the steps behind the extension has increased from 1m under the previous proposal to approximately 1.5m under the revised one. With regards to proposed boundary fencing along the unattached boundary, whereas P0666.22 included the provision of boundary fencing projecting over 11m beyond the rear of this neighbouring property, fencing proposed along this boundary would project about 6m beyond the rear of this neighbouring property.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Consideration has been given to the design of the proposed extension and its impacts on the rear character and appearance of the rear garden scene as well as surrounding area.

The projection of the extension beyond the rear of the property as well as its height would not comply with guidelines in the SPD for single storey rear extensions to semi-detached properties.

Consideration has been given to the depth, scale and proportions of the proposed extension. It is noted that the host dwelling benefits from a sizable rear garden, meaning that the it would not dominate its rear garden scene. Given that the proposal is judged to not adversely affect the character of the property or the visual amenities of the rear garden scene, on balance, its visual

impacts on the rear garden environment including with regards to its materials is considered acceptable. It is also judged to not have a detrimental impact on the HLPAs as it would be complementary to the existing dwelling.

As for the proposed patio area, raised patios are not an unusual feature within rear gardens along Courtenay Gardens. This element of the proposals are therefore not considered to materially adversely affect the character of the property or the visual amenities of the rear garden scene.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Consideration has been given to the impacts of the proposed developments on the amenity of surrounding neighbours.

In terms of its impacts on the attached neighbours no. 56 Courtenay Gardens, it is noted they benefit from a single storey rear extension of the same depth as the proposal. It is therefore not considered the proposal would cause harm to the amenity of these neighbouring occupiers as the proposal would not project beyond the rear of no. 56 and their extension would mitigate the impacts the proposal on the amenity of these neighbours. Given the height of the fencing proposed along the attached boundary, it is not considered that the raised patio would result in overlooking or loss of privacy to this neighbour.

As for the impact on no. 52 Courtenay Gardens, they benefit from a side/rear extension. Given the extension to this neighbour, the proposal would extend approximately 2.8m beyond the rear of these occupiers of this neighbouring property, a projection which would be less than the 4m usually deemed permissible by the SPD where a semi-detached neighbour has not extended. The element of the extension which projects beyond the rear of this neighbour would be 3.5m high from the patio/walkway within the application site. Whilst the height of the proposal would be in excess of guidelines, given its degree of inset from the common boundary coupled with the fact that its projection beyond the neighbour would be policy compliant, on balance, it is judged the impacts of the extension on this neighbour would be within reasonable tolerances and not so harmful so as to warrant a refusal.

Given the submitted plans show there would be a 1.8m high fence along the unattached boundary it is not considered that there are grounds to refuse the application in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy into this neighbour's rear garden from the proposed walkway and, given the reduction in the projection of the proposed fencing beyond this neighbour compared to the previously refused scheme, it is not considered that the projection of the proposed boundary fence beyond this neighbour's dwelling would be harmful to these neighbouring occupiers either.

Officers do not consider that any light pollution would be significantly harmful to residential amenity so as to warrant a refusal.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The loss of the existing garage is not considered to give rise to any highways/parking issues as there is space for car parking to the front of the site for one car.

OTHER ISSUES

Officers acknowledge that the existing hedges and trees along the boundary could provide biodiverse habitats. However there is no evidence that the site contains any protected species (which if discovered are protected under separate legislation) and the existing landscaping within the site is not protected, so could be removed at any time without consent.

TREES

It is noted there is a tree within the curtilage of the application site along the shared attached boundary with no. 56 Courtenay Gardens that would be lost as a result of the proposal. Council records indicate that this tree has no statutory protection however and so it is not judged that there are material grounds to refuse planning permission based on the impacts of the proposal on trees within or near the application site.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposals are considered to be acceptable and, as such, the APPROVAL is recommended subject to conditions.

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 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.

3 SC10C Materials as per application form

The proposed development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the materials detailed under the Materials Section of the application form unless otherwise agreed

in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the proposed development will harmonise with the character of the surrounding area.

4 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 plans) shall be formed in the flank walls of the building 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.

5 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 Approval - No negotiation required

Statement Required by Article 35(2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2015: No significant problems were identified during the consideration of the application, and therefore it has been determined in accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Authorising Officer:



Neil Goate

14th November 2025