0208 076 9300
info@pdimensions.co.uk
www.pdimensions.co.uk

Unit 7, Hawthorn BP
165 Granville Road
London, NW2 2AZ

Planning Statement

34 Candover Road, Hornchurch, Essex RM12 4TZ
Proposed single-storey side and rear extension incorporating infill

1. Introduction

This statement supports a householder planning application for a single-storey side and rear extension at 34 Candover Road. The proposal brings together the extension layouts identified on the submitted drawings under references Y0103.26 and Y0196.26, incorporating an infill between them to provide a connected and practical ground-floor arrangement.

The statement should be read alongside the proposed PR6 drawings dated 12 October 2026, particularly the ground-floor plan PR-PL-001, roof plan, elevations and sections.

The principal planning considerations are the appearance of the combined development, its effect on neighbouring living conditions and the relevance of the previous prior approval decisions. Particular regard is also given to the successful appeal at 12 Ardleigh Close, Hornchurch, where the Inspector allowed an approximately 8m-deep rear extension incorporating infill within a prior approval layout.

2. Planning history

Two relevant decisions relate to the application property:

- **Y0103.26:** Havering's planning register records a decision dated **10 June 2026** that prior approval was not required for a single-storey rear extension with an overall depth of **8m**, maximum height of **3m** and eaves height of **3m**.
- **Y0196.26:** The decision notice dated **2 October 2026** grants prior approval for a single-storey rear extension with an overall depth of **8m**, maximum height of **3m** and eaves height of **3m**.

The present application therefore seeks express planning permission for the combined proposal, including the infill.

DIMENSIONS
PLANNING | ARCHITECTURE | CONSULTANCY

0208 076 9300
info@pdimensions.co.uk
www.pdimensions.co.uk

Unit 7, Hawthorn BP
165 Granville Road
London, NW2 2AZ

3. The proposal

The proposed ground-floor plan distinguishes the two previous scheme layouts and highlights the intervening infill. The resulting accommodation includes a connected kitchen and dining area, providing a more usable arrangement than separate projecting elements.

The plan retains a stepped rear footprint rather than extending the whole width to the deepest rear building line. It identifies approximately **103.55m² of rear garden**, retaining outdoor amenity space. The drawings specify external materials to match the existing property.

The design case is that the infill integrates the identified extension elements into a coherent addition.

4. Planning considerations

Design and residential amenity

The relevant local considerations include Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan, concerning residential design and amenity, and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

The SPD requires attention to privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook. Paragraph 5.2 identifies site-specific considerations affecting acceptable extension depth. Paragraph 5.3 gives general depth guidance of 4m for detached and semi-detached houses, with additional guidance for greater projections. Paragraph 5.6 generally limits flat-roofed single-storey extensions to 3m in height. However, paragraphs 1.11–1.12 recognise that the guidance is not prescriptive and that individual circumstances may justify a different approach.

The application should therefore be assessed on its actual effects rather than extension depth alone. Relevant considerations include the single-storey form, retained garden, matching materials and the position of the infill relative to the outer extension walls.

The prior approval history provides important context, but the combined proposal must also be considered as a whole. Particular attention should be given to any additional enclosure, roof bulk or overshadowing arising from the infill. The applicant's case is that connecting the identified elements offers a practical design improvement; the extent of any additional effect should be assessed against the approved drawings and neighbouring relationships.

DIMENSIONS
PLANNING | ARCHITECTURE | CONSULTANCY

0208 076 9300
info@pdimensions.co.uk
www.pdimensions.co.uk

Unit 7, Hawthorn BP
165 Granville Road
London, NW2 2AZ

Previous schemes as a fallback

The previous decisions are relevant to the assessment of what development could otherwise take place. Their weight as a fallback depends on demonstrating that the development relied upon is lawful and represents a realistic possibility of implementation.

The comparison should distinguish between each scheme individually and any proposition that both could be implemented together. The existence of separate prior approval decisions does not, by itself, establish the latter.

Subject to that distinction, the Council is invited to consider whether the proposed infill produces any materially greater harm than the development that could realistically be carried out without the present permission.

5. Relevant appeal: 12 Ardleigh Close

At **12 Ardleigh Close, Hornchurch RM11 2SS**, Havering refused application **P0495.25** for a single-storey rear extension. Inspector **A Caines** allowed the appeal, reference **6000376**, on **22 August 2025**. The decision is reproduced in Appendix 1.

The appeal concerned a flat-roofed extension approximately **8m deep and 3m high**. The principal issue was its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 10, particularly outlook.

The Inspector recognised that the SPD's general depth guidance was not prescriptive. The assessment took account of the extension's modest height, approximately 1m separation from the boundary, existing fencing and generous rear gardens.

Of particular relevance, the Inspector considered a prior approval fallback comprising two projecting elements separated by a narrow gap. Infilling the central section was found to provide a more coherent and practical design, with potentially less visual and spatial impact than the fallback arrangement. This added weight in favour of allowing the appeal.

The decision is relevant to the present proposal because both involve consideration of a substantial rear extension and the benefit of infilling between elements identified in prior approval layouts. It supports an assessment focused on the actual planning effects and the realistic fallback, rather than a refusal based solely on exceeding the SPD's general depth guidance.

The appeal does not establish that every 8m extension or infill proposal is acceptable. Its boundary separation, screening and neighbouring relationships were specific to Ardleigh Close. Nevertheless, its reasoning is a material consideration which should be addressed when assessing the comparable design and fallback arguments at Candover Road.

0208 076 9300
info@pdimensions.co.uk
www.pdimensions.co.uk

Unit 7, Hawthorn BP
165 Granville Road
London, NW2 2AZ

6. Conclusion

The proposal seeks to bring together the extension layouts identified under Y0103.26 and Y0196.26 through an infill that improves the arrangement and usability of the ground floor.

The single-storey form, matching materials, stepped footprint and retained rear garden support the design case. The previous decisions and the successful Ardleigh Close appeal provide further material context, subject to establishing the lawful and realistic fallback and assessing the effects of the complete proposal.

The Council is invited to grant planning permission following consideration of these site-specific circumstances, with appropriate conditions to safeguard neighbouring amenity.