

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: Y0011.26

WARD: Havering-atte-Bower

Date Received: 19th January 2026

ADDRESS: 24 Merlin Road
Romford

PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension with an overall depth of 6.00m, a maximum height of 3.15m, and an eaves height of 3.00m. (PRIOR APPROVAL)

DRAWING NO(S): LIVARCH/24 MR/101A
LIVARCH/24 MR/103A
LIVARCH/24 MR/104A
LIVARCH/24 MR/106A

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that **Prior Approval is Refused**

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is a two-storey end of terrace property, sited on the eastern side of Merlin Road. There is an existing single storey rear conservatory on site (to be removed). There is also an existing rear shed (to be removed) on site.

The property is not a listed building, is not located within a conservation area and is not the subject of any other designations relevant to the assessment of this application.

THE PROPOSAL

Single storey rear extension with an overall depth of 6.00m, a maximum height of 3.15m, and an eaves height of 3.00m. (PRIOR APPROVAL).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

P1577.25	Erection of gym/storage/shower rear outbuilding
	Apprv with cons 05-02-2026

REPRESENTATION SUMMARY

One letter of objections was received, and the following concerns were raised:

1.Loss of light to their kitchen/dining room and rear garden.

2.The proposed extension is not keeping with the terrace houses in the area.

It should be noted that above point 2 cannot be considered under this application. Only point 1 and would be taken into consideration, as objections have been received from adjoining properties on amenity grounds. As such, the proposed works can only be considered on effect on the amenity of adjoining properties is acceptable or not.

These will be considered within the relevant sections of the report below.

The legislation governing Larger Home Extension, prior approval process is clear that the focus is on amenity considerations in the event that an objection is received.

PLANNING POLICIES

Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

MHCLG Permitted development rights for householders Technical Guidance (September 2019).

OFFICER APPRAISAL

In accordance with the current protocol for site visits, an in-person site visit was not undertaken as one was not considered to be necessary. Site photos provided by the agent, Google Street View TM, aerial view images and the submitted drawings were used to assess the site constraints.

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

The SPD Guidelines indicate that terrace houses can normally be extended from the rear wall of the original dwelling by up to 3m and that they should generally be no more than 3m in height for a single storey extension with a flat roof. This is to ensure there is no unreasonable loss of amenity to neighbouring properties or reduction in sunlight or daylight.

As per the plans and application form, the overall height is approx. 3.15m including the two rooflights and 3m high at eaves level, which does not fully comply with the guidance. However, the overall depth of the proposed replacement rear extension at 6m would exceed guidance of 3m normally permissible by 3m in depth.

It is considered that the proposed 6m deep extension would not create an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the un-attached neighbours at No. 22 Merlin Road, as the proposal would be setback by at least approx. 2.8m from the side access/alleyway (sited between the properties) and the existing rear building line of the application site already projects beyond the rear elevation of this neighbour to the south (who front building line projects beyond the application site). It is considered this separation distance would acceptably mitigate the impacts of the extension on this neighbour to the south. Owing to the orientation, it is not considered that there would be a significant light loss.

As such, it is considered that the proposal would not unacceptably impact on this neighbour at 22 Merlin Road.

However, of a greater concern, is the potential impact on No. 26 Merlin Road (north). It is noted that this neighbouring dwelling has no extension to the rear of their dwelling. The proposed rear extension would project total of 6m (existing conservatory 3.1m deep on site) in depth beyond the edge of their rear elevation, which would exceed the 3m normally permissible under current guidance.

The proposal would infringe a 45 degree line from the 3m point on the boundary with No. 26 Merlin Road due to the proposal excessive depth of 6m and no extension sited on the side shared boundary with the application site at no. 24.

For these reasons, it is considered that the 6m deep rear extension with its proximity close to the boundary would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjacent residents at No. 26 Merlin Road. It is considered the depth and close proximity to the boundary would unacceptably overbear and dominate the outlook and amenity of the adjacent neighbour to the north.

It is considered the single storey rear extension will give rise to an uncomfortable overbearing effect and sense of enclosure harmful to their amenity.

For the reasons outlined above, it is considered the proposal is deemed unneighbourly and therefore fails to comply with guidance set out in the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons outlined above, it is recommended that the application is refused.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that **Prior Approval is Refused**

1 Reason for refusal - impact on adjoining neighbour

The Council consider that the impact of the proposed development, by reason of its depth and proximity to the boundary of the site, would unacceptably harm the amenity of the adjoining neighbour at No.26 Merlin Road, by reason of loss of outlook and overbearing effect on this property.

INFORMATIVES

1 PRA Refused Informative 1

This written notice indicates that the proposed development would not comply with condition A.4 of Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. It is important to note that this written notice does not indicate whether or not the proposed development would comply with any of the other limitations of

conditions of Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A.

The applicant has the right to an appeal against this notice to the Planning Inspectorate, see details below.

Authorising Officer:

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

Raphael Adenegan

23rd February 2026