

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P1366.25

WARD: Upminster

Date Received: 21st October 2025

ADDRESS: May Cottage
Fen Lane
North Ockendon
UPMINSTER

PROPOSAL: Two storey front, side and rear extensions and roof extension to facilitate conversion of bungalow to two storey dwelling with habitable loft and rear dormer, erection of cart lodge and construction of swimming pool/pool house

DRAWING NO(S): 2024/665/0207 Rev A
2024/665/0101 Rev A
2024/665/0208
2024/665/0202 Rev A
2024/665/0500
2024/665/0102 Rev A
2024/665/0201 Rev B

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the reason(s) given at the end of the report

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises of a detached, residential chalet bungalow located on the south side of Fen Lane, 100 metres from the junction with the B186. The application premises is within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The site is a short distance from the North Ockendon Conservation Area and there are Grade II Listed buildings in the vicinity, however the site is not within the CA.

THE PROPOSAL

Consent is sought for the partial demolition of the existing dwelling and the formation of two storey front, side and rear extensions, a roof extension to facilitate conversion of bungalow to two storey dwelling with habitable loft and rear dormer, erection of cart lodge and construction of swimming pool/pool house

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant

P0284.16

Addition of two pitched roof dormers to front roof slope. Alterations to rear elevation including single storey rear extension and alterations to existing pitched roof dormer.

Apprv with cons

09-06-2016

REPRESENTATION SUMMARY

Those who directly adjoin the site were invited to comment directly, a site notice was also displayed at the site by the applicant. In addition to those consultation measures the application was advertised in the local press. One letter of objection was received which raised the following concerns:

- Out of scale/keeping with locality.
- Overlooking/loss of privacy
- Siting of pool/cart-house detrimental to amenity.

Some matters raised, such as the use of the property for parties etc, as well as disturbance during any works are not material planning considerations. The use of the property and any associated noise would not be a material consideration for the purposes of assessing the development. The direct impacts such as the scale, loss of light and overshadowing as well as any privacy issues arising along with noise from any plant and machinery would be material factors for consideration.

No comments were received from other stakeholders.

PLANNING POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework (2025)

National Planning Practice Guidance

London Plan (2021) policies: D1 - London's form, character and capacity for growth; D4 - Delivering good design; and T6 - Car parking - G2 London's Green Belt

Havering Local Plan (2021) policies: Policy 7 - Residential design and amenity; Policy 24 - Parking provision and design; and Policy 26 - Urban design

Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2011)

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

The existing floor area is in the region of 200sqm, the proposals would result in a dwelling with a floor area of approx. 364sqm, a net increase of 164sqm. Accordingly the proposals would require a contribution under Mayoral and Havering CIL equivalent to that as follows:

£4100 - MCIL (£25 per sqm)
£20,500 - HCIL (£125 per sqm)

OFFICER APPRAISAL

Even in the Green Belt there is no preclusion against extensions and alterations to dwellings, in fact in most cases development can be carried out using permitted development rights. The proposals however in view of their scale and resultant mass require consideration as to their principle in the Green Belt, Design and Amenity impacts.

GREEN BELT IMPLICATIONS

Consent has previously been given in this location for Addition of two pitched roof dormers to front roof slope, alterations to rear elevation including single storey rear extension and alterations to existing pitched roof dormer through REF: P0284.16. From review of the drawings submitted as well as aerial photographs for the site it is evident that that development has not been carried out in its entirety with only the single storey extension and alterations to the existing pitched roof dormers to the rear carried out.

Para 154 of the NPPF states that a Local Planning Authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate development in the Green Belt however details a number of exceptions which include at Para 154(c) "the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building".

Ancillary outbuildings and development are not precluded against, typically permitted development rights would allow for them.

The term disproportionate is not defined by the Framework, historically the Council had a more prescriptive policy when determining whether extensions/alterations were disproportionate reasoning that a 50% increase over the original dwelling house was generally the threshold. Whilst no longer adopted policy the Council has at times used volumetric increase to assist with decision making although this is recognised not to be the sole means of gauging disproportionality. On the previous submission at this property, which was implemented as outlined above the applicant provided calculations.

At that time officers used those calculations to cross reference with their own calculation. The view was that the original cubic capacity of the dwelling house was approximately 657m³. The sum of the additions subject of P0284.16 was 152.8m³, which represented an increase of approximately 23.25% of the original cubic capacity of the dwelling house. It is reasonable to contend then at that time as officers did that those additions were negligible in terms of their impact on the subject property. This view was not based on the volume calculations alone, the additions were subservient in scale however, and contained to the existing built envelope largely.

Officers estimate based on the drawings provided and those earlier calculations as a starting point that the volume of the resultant dwelling if the development proposed was carried out would be in the region of 950m³ cubic metres. This equates to an increase of approx. 44.6% based on the cubic capacity of the original dwelling house. The visual appearance of the dwelling would be wholly

changed and the gabled roof form and design choices would contribute to visual bulk which in a relatively open setting would contribute to a visually prominent dwelling house, out of scale with its immediate neighbour and far removed from the existing arrangement.

When factoring in the cart-lodge (in the region of 187m³) which is of a considerable size itself, it is reasonable to conclude that the volumetric increase on site and that which would be visible largely from the public realm would be well in excess of 50% and closer to 73%. With regards to the pool and pool-house associated, it is accepted that these features are subservient in scale and whilst contributing to the following conclusion are not determinative features.

In view of the design concept, resultant scale, bulk and mass and presence in the street-scene along with the siting and scale of the associated cart-lodge, the proposals would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The development would therefore conflict with the objectives of the Framework and would be unacceptable in principle. In reaching this view officers have had regard to the design choices and mass of the dwelling as well as the spatial impacts associated in the context of relatively subdued and open setting of this side of Fen Lane on which the proposals would have a profound impact. The extensions proposed and proposed cart-lodge would have visual and spatial impacts on the openness of the Green Belt.

No very special circumstances (VSC) to justify the harm identified have been submitted with the application. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy G2 of the London Plan.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Local, London-wide and national planning policy and guidance seeks to ensure that new development is well designed. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates successful places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Development plan policies seek to ensure that new development is designed so that it respects the distinctive identity and character of the site and area, is of high architectural quality, provides site specific design solutions, reinforces and complements the streets-cene, responds to local patterns of development and respects the visual integrity and established scale and massing of the site and wider area. It also supports the use of high-quality materials that integrate with surrounding buildings. The Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD provides further guidance on how an appropriate design can be achieved.

The proposed extensions and alterations would wholly change the contribution of the subject dwelling to the street-scene. The increased width, height and mass throughout including the design concept would change entirely its appearance in the street-scene. The site borders an open field and represents the end of the cluster of homes which are set around the junction with Ockendon Road and which return into Fen Lane. Beyond the site dwellings are fewer and separated by greater distances. On the opposing side of Fen lane, there is a group of larger dwellings which have been extended historically with extensive planning history in some instances (Upweys/Deeside). Between the Warren and the Ladyville Lodge Care Home permission in principle for new dwelling (three) was refused with a subsequent appeal dismissed in early 2026.

It is accepted that in the case of Deeside and Upweys, that each have been extended historically and are of a scale greater than dwellings located on the south side of Fen Lane. Unlike the subject

property and its neighbours they form a close grouping of three dwellings with an eaves height which is generally consistent and they occupy more narrow plots respectively. The applicant reasons that similarly scaled dwellings are in the vicinity however this neither recognises that the additions proposed to the subject dwelling would result in a dwelling of overall greater width and bulk than those examples referred to (Figs 3/4 of the DAS), nor does it take into consideration the circumstances of the application site and its open character. Officers consider that the contribution of the three dwellings on the northern side of Fen Lane to the east is one that is removed from the subject site.

The extensions and alterations proposed to the subject dwelling would result in a dwelling wholly out of scale and keeping with the adjacent neighbouring dwelling and one which would have stark and jarring appearance in view of the open setting beyond when travelling east along Fen Lane. It would form a prominent and visually intrusive feature. This would be exacerbated by the overall height and width of the dwelling, gabled ends, design concept and lack of articulation. The flank elevation whilst broken up by the single storey section with hipped roof, nevertheless would present as a wall of development. In view of the low level of the neighbouring property and open space between this flank would be highly visible. The provision of the cart-lodge, some six metres to the pitched roof forward of the established front building line would exacerbate the visual impacts of the development further and this would form a prominent uncharacteristic addition to the street-scene itself.

Whilst the pool house and pool in the rear garden environment do not raise any particular design concerns, subject to clarification on any hard-standing/landscaping, it is not considered that the other aspect of the development cumulatively respond acceptably to existing local character, nor do they introduce positive new character. Officers do not consider that the proposals align with the objectives of the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD in so far as that the extensions and alterations proposed to the subject dwelling, and provision of the detached cart-lodge would dominate and detract from the character of the original house would, would lack of articulation and would introduce unsympathetic design features. The proposals are therefore contrary to the objectives of the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD, Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016 and 2031 and the NPPF specifically Para 135 which requires development add to the overall quality of the area and establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Local, London-wide and national planning policy and guidance seeks to secure development which protects amenity. Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan identifies that development should be of a high design quality that ensures the amenity and quality of life of existing and future residents is not adversely impacted. To protect amenity, the Council will support developments which do not result in unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight. The Council will also support development which does not cause unacceptable levels of noise, vibration and disturbance. Further advice on how to achieve these objectives is provided in the Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

The subject property is detached and set within a spacious plot, with an open field to the east. Accordingly the amenity impacts arising from the proposals are limited to the adjoining site Brelades which is itself a detached bungalow set within its own spacious plot.

When viewed from aerial photography and from the street, Brelades is well separated from the subject dwelling. The parcel of land separating the two dwellings reads almost as separate piece of land and aerial photography does suggest this with the main garden area of Brelades screened by planting more immediately around that dwelling. The parcel of land has been subject to an application for a separate dwelling in 2004 which was unsuccessful. Irrespective of the visual impression of this piece of land it remains part of the adjoining site as rear garden and therefore is afforded consideration in amenity terms.

To that end it is reasonable to conclude that the impacts of the development in terms of its increased mass and height and accordingly any loss of light would be negligible in respect of primary windows in the dwelling. Whilst there would be new views (intensifying the existing roof level of the dwelling) and the provision of higher level windows it is not considered that these views would be unneighbourly or uncharacteristic in view of the surrounding environment which is observed to have similar relationships. Whilst the added windows at high level are observed they are set-away to the other side of the plot. Any views over the most used areas of the adjoining site would be at an oblique angle and any remaining views would not be materially harmful in planning terms in view of surrounding character.

The proposed extensions would include a flat roofed terrace at first floor level. Whilst this would contribute to mass and the perception of the dwelling from the adjoining site, it is considered that privacy screening might be erected which would address any immediate views. Whilst a raised terrace area would of course encourage extended use and prolonged views privacy screening would angle any immediate views to the south west. Officers would impose through condition (in the event of approval) a condition requiring privacy screening to the flanks and in the case of the flank adjacent to the site of Brelades requiring the privacy screening be set back to the flank wall of the dwelling. It is evident that this is consistent with the applicant's intentions given that the balustrade is indicatively shown to run to this point only.

As to the massing of the dwelling more generally and the impression of the dwelling from the adjoining site, in particular the garden the applicant has sought to increase the degree of separation from the shared boundary with this neighbour over the existing. The partial demolition of the house sets the new development away from the boundary. Accordingly where there is increased mass over that as existing it is well removed from the shared boundary. Whilst the steeply pitched side projection, overall ridge height and gabled roof form raise separate issues, it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would be unduly overbearing from the adjoining site.

The siting of a pool in the rear garden is not objectionable and whilst comments made over its use and associated noise are noted, it is not considered that this is a material planning consideration or something which could be used to oppose the development. A condition will be imposed requiring any plant/machinery comply with the Council's required standard of not less than 10dB below prevailing background noise at any given time. It is considered that this would be a reasonable measure to impose. The proposed pool house would be sited more than 2m from the shared boundary and would be modestly proportioned with a roof which would be hipped away from the side boundary and an overall height of less than 3m (2.90m). Whilst it would be perceptible over existing boundary treatment it is not considered that it would be materially harmful to amenity. The use could of course be controlled by planning condition to ensure that it remains incidental to the main dwelling house.

Turning then to the proposed cart-lodge this would be set to the undeveloped side of the property

and accordingly would be well removed from neighbouring dwellings. Whilst this building would feature an external staircase with an overall ridge height of approx. 6.20m to accommodate a home office space, whilst there are street-scene and other considerations which arise, it is not considered that it would be objectionable in amenity terms.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

Policy 24 of the Havering Local Plan sets out the appropriate parking standards for different parts of the borough and states that where a development proposal would result in a net loss of car parking spaces the applicant will be required to demonstrate that there is no need for them. It also identifies that the Council will support proposals which consider the location and layout of parking provision as an integral part of the design process, site parking close to people's homes in areas with natural surveillance and provide appropriate landscaping, that visually screens car parking to the front of dwellings. The design and layout of the development is not found to result in any significant parking or highways impacts, it is therefore acceptable and policy compliant in these regards.

OTHER ISSUES

The Equality Act 2010 (as amended) imposes important duties on public authorities in the exercise of their functions and specifically introduced a Public Sector Equality Duty. Under this duty, public organisations are required to have due regard for the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and must advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. In considering this application and preparing this report officers have had careful regard to the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 (as amended). They have concluded that the decision recommended will not conflict with the Council's duties under this important legislation.

TREES

There is observed to be planting at the boundaries of the site including some mature trees at the rear boundary. The drawings do not provide any indication of existing planting, in contrast to observations made when viewing aerial photographs. The application form indicates that no trees or hedges would need to be pruned or removed to carry out the proposed development.

It is accepted that the development would be well removed from the rear of the site where there are mature trees and that through the demolition of the existing flank wall and setting in of the property that there might be scope to retain some of the planting in situ at the flank boundary. The siting of the poolhouse similarly is set-in from the shared boundary and away from the most populated areas of planting observed on aerial photography. On balance, in view of there being no TPOs it is considered that a condition requiring a scheme of TPP could be imposed in the event of approval, along with a condition requiring details of landscaping.

Mandatory BNG is not applicable as this is a householder development.

CONCLUSION

There is no preclusion against alterations or extensions to the subject dwelling and the provision of buildings incidental to its use. However for the reasons given in the preceding sections of this report 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 Green Belt

The design concept and resultant scale, bulk and mass of the dwelling, along with the prominently sited and large cart-lodge with upper level space would result disproportionate additions to the subject dwelling and would therefore materially harm the character and openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt. No very special circumstances to justify such harm have been submitted with the application. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy G2 of the London Plan.

2 Design/Local Character

The proposed extensions and alterations to the subject dwelling would result in a visually dominant and intrusive piece of development, out of scale with neighbouring dwellings and incompatible with the surrounding environment. The development would not comply with the objectives of the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD in so far as that the extensions and alterations proposed to the subject dwelling, and provision of the detached cart-lodge would dominate and detract from the character of the original house, would lack of articulation and would introduce unsympathetic design features. The proposals are therefore contrary to the objectives of the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD, Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016 and 2031 and the NPPF specifically Para 135 which requires development add to the overall quality of the area and establish or maintain 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, notification of intended refusal and the reason(s) for it was given to the agent in writing 04-02-2026.

2 Refusal and CIL

The proposal, if granted planning permission on appeal, would be liable for the Mayor of London and Havering Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Based upon the information supplied with the application, the Mayoral CIL payable would be £4100 based on the calculation of £25.00 per square metre and the Havering Community Infrastructure Levy (HCIL) would be a charge of £20,500 based on calculation of £125 per square metre. Each would be subject to indexation.

Further details with regard to CIL are available from the Council's website.

Authorising Officer:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Raphael Adenegan', written in a cursive style.

Raphael Adenegan

4th February 2026