



# Havering

L O N D O N   B O R O U G H

## PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

<b>7.30 pm</b>	<b>Thursday 23 September 2021</b>	<b>Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford</b>
----------------	---------------------------------------	---

Members 8: Quorum 4

### COUNCILLORS:

**Conservative Group  
(4)**

Robby Misir (Chairman)  
Carol Smith (Vice-Chair)  
Philippa Crowder  
Matt Sutton

**Residents' Group  
(1)**

Stephanie Nunn

**Upminster & Cranham  
Residents Group'  
(1)**

John Tyler

**Independent Residents  
Group  
(1)**

David Durant

**Labour Group  
(1)**

Paul McGeary

**For information about the meeting please contact:  
Richard Cursons - 01708 432430  
[richard.cursons@onesource.co.uk](mailto:richard.cursons@onesource.co.uk)**

**To register to speak at the meeting please call 01708 433100  
Before 5.00pm on Tuesday 21 September 2021**

## **Protocol for members of the public wishing to report on meetings of the London Borough of Havering**

Members of the public are entitled to report on meetings of Council, Committees and Cabinet, except in circumstances where the public have been excluded as permitted by law.

Reporting means:-

- filming, photographing or making an audio recording of the proceedings of the meeting;
- using any other means for enabling persons not present to see or hear proceedings at a meeting as it takes place or later; or
- reporting or providing commentary on proceedings at a meeting, orally or in writing, so that the report or commentary is available as the meeting takes place or later if the person is not present.

Anyone present at a meeting as it takes place is not permitted to carry out an oral commentary or report. This is to prevent the business of the meeting being disrupted.

Anyone attending a meeting is asked to advise Democratic Services staff on 01708 433076 that they wish to report on the meeting and how they wish to do so. This is to enable employees to guide anyone choosing to report on proceedings to an appropriate place from which to be able to report effectively.

Members of the public are asked to remain seated throughout the meeting as standing up and walking around could distract from the business in hand.



## **AGENDA ITEMS**

### **1 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chairman will announce details of the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building's evacuation.

These are the arrangements in case of fire or other events that might require the meeting room or building's evacuation. (Double doors at the entrance to the Council Chamber and door on the right hand corner (marked as an exit).

Proceed down main staircase, out the main entrance, turn left along front of building to side car park, turn left and proceed to the "Fire Assembly Point" at the corner of the rear car park. Await further instructions.

I would like to remind members of the public that Councillors have to make decisions on planning applications strictly in accordance with planning principles.

I would also like to remind members of the public that the decisions may not always be popular, but they should respect the need for Councillors to take decisions that will stand up to external scrutiny or accountability.

Would members of the public also note that they are not allowed to communicate with or pass messages to Councillors during the meeting.

### **2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

(if any) - receive.

### **3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Members are invited to disclose any interest in any of the items on the agenda at this point of the meeting.

*Members may still disclose any interest in an item at any time prior to the consideration of the matter.*

### **4 MINUTES (Pages 1 - 4)**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 26 August 2021 and to authorise the Chairman to sign them.

**5 APPLICATIONS FOR DECISION** (Pages 5 - 8)

See attached document

**6 P1824.20 - LAND NORTH END OF IMPERIAL TRADING ESTATE** (Pages 9 - 16)

Report attached.

**7 P0530.21 - 35 BIRCH CRESCENT, HORNCHURCH** (Pages 17 - 22)

Report attached.

**Andrew Beesley**  
**Head of Democratic Services**

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
Havering Town Hall, Main Road, Romford  
26 August 2021 (7.30 - 8.30 pm)**

**Present:**

**COUNCILLORS: 8**

**Conservative Group** Robby Misir (in the Chair) Carol Smith (Vice-Chair),  
Philippa Crowder and Matt Sutton

**Residents' Group** Stephanie Nunn

**Upminster & Cranham  
Residents' Group** John Tyler

**Independent Residents  
Group**

**Labour Group**

Apologies were received for the absence of Councillors David Durant and Paul McGeary.

Councillors Paul McGeary and Ron Ower were present for the meeting virtually.

Unless otherwise indicated all decisions were agreed with no vote against.

Through the Chairman, announcements were made regarding emergency evacuation arrangements and the decision making process followed by the Committee.

**9 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

There were no disclosures of interest.

**10 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 July 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

11     **P0866.21 - 109A FRONT LANE, CRANHAM - PROPOSED ANCILLARY ANNEX TO REAR OF EXISTING DWELLING.**

The committee was informed that the Councillor call-ins had been withdrawn on this application and the application would be determined by officers under delegated powers.

12     **P0492.21 - 12 BERKELEY CLOSE, UPMINSTER - ERECTION OF A 3-BED DETACHED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING AND AMENITY SPACE AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING DROPPED KERB**

The committee was informed that the Councillor call-ins had been withdrawn on this application and the application would be determined by officers under delegated powers.

13     **P0681.21 - 51 SPRINGFIELD GARDENS, UPMINSTER - PART SINGLE AND PART TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS**

Members considered the report and noted that it had been called-in by Councillor Ron Ower.

In accordance with the public speaking arrangements the committee was addressed by an objector with no response from the applicant.

With its agreement Councillor Ron Ower addressed the committee.

Following consideration it was **RESOLVED** that **PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED**.

The vote for the resolution to grant planning permission was granted by 4 votes to 1 with 1 abstention.

Councillors Misir, Sutton, P Crowder and Smith voted for the resolution.

Councillor Stephanie Nunn voted against the resolution.

Councillor John Tyler abstained from voting.

14     **PLANNING COMMITTEE - QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE**

The report before the committee provided a summary of performance on planning applications, appeals and planning enforcement for the previous quarter April to June 2021.

The committee considered the report and **noted** its contents.



---

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

## Agenda Item 5

### Applications for Decision

#### Introduction

1. In this part of the agenda are reports on planning applications for determination by the committee.
2. Although the reports are set out in order on the agenda, the Chair may reorder the agenda on the night. Therefore, if you wish to be present for a specific application, you need to be at the meeting from the beginning.
3. The following information and advice only applies to reports in this part of the agenda.

#### Advice to Members

#### Material planning considerations

4. The Committee is required to consider planning applications against the development plan and other material planning considerations.
5. The development plan for Havering comprises the following documents:
  - London Plan Adopted March 2021
  - Core Strategy and Development Control Policies (2008)
  - Site Allocations (2008)
  - Romford Area Action Plan (2008)
  - Joint Waste Development Plan (2012)
6. Decisions must be taken in accordance with section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires the Committee to have regard to the provisions of the Development Plan, so far as material to the application; any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application; and any other material considerations. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the Committee to make its determination in accordance with the Development Plan unless material planning considerations support a different decision being taken.
7. Under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects listed buildings or their settings, the local planning authority must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of architectural or historic interest it possesses.
8. Under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development

which affects a conservation area, the local planning authority must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

9. Under Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in considering whether to grant planning permission for any development, the local planning authority must ensure, whenever it is appropriate, that adequate provision is made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees.
10. In accordance with Article 35 of the Development Management Procedure Order 2015, Members are invited to agree the recommendations set out in the reports, which have been made based on the analysis of the scheme set out in each report. This analysis has been undertaken on the balance of the policies and any other material considerations set out in the individual reports.

#### Non-material considerations

11. Members are reminded that other areas of legislation cover many aspects of the development process and therefore do not need to be considered as part of determining a planning application. The most common examples are:
  - Building Regulations deal with structural integrity of buildings, the physical performance of buildings in terms of their consumption of energy, means of escape in case of fire, access to buildings by the Fire Brigade to fight fires etc.
  - Works within the highway are controlled by Highways Legislation.
  - Environmental Health covers a range of issues including public nuisance, food safety, licensing, pollution control etc.
  - Works on or close to the boundary are covered by the Party Wall Act.
  - Covenants and private rights over land are enforced separately from planning and should not be considered.

#### Local financial considerations

12. In accordance with Policy 6.5 of the London Plan (2015) the Mayor of London has introduced a London wide Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to fund CrossRail.
13. Other forms of necessary infrastructure (as defined in the CIL Regulations) and any mitigation of the development that is necessary will be secured through a section106 agreement. Where these are necessary, it will be explained and specified in the agenda reports.

#### **Public speaking and running order**

14. The Council's Constitution allows for public speaking on these items in accordance with the Constitution and the Chair's discretion.
15. The items on this part of the agenda will run as follows where there are registered public speakers:

- a. Officer introduction of the development
  - b. Registered Objector(s) speaking slot (3 minutes)
  - c. Responding Applicant speaking slot (3 minutes)
  - d. Ward Councillor(s) speaking slots (3 minutes)
  - e. Officer presentation of the material planning considerations
  - f. Committee questions and debate
  - g. Committee decision
16. The items on this part of the agenda will run as follows where there are no public speakers:
- a. Where requested by the Chairman, officer presentation of the main issues
  - b. Committee questions and debate
  - c. Committee decision

### **Late information**

17. Any relevant material received since the publication of this part of the agenda, concerning items on it, will be reported to the Committee in the Update Report.

### **Recommendation**

18. The Committee to take any decisions recommended in the attached report(s).

This page is intentionally left blank

 <b>Havering</b> LONDON BOROUGH	<b>Planning Committee</b> <b>23 September 2021</b>
---	---

<b>Application Reference:</b>	<b>P1824.20</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>Land North End of Imperial Trading Estate</b>
<b>Ward:</b>	<b>Rainham &amp; Wennington</b>
<b>Description:</b>	<b>Upgrade of existing base station consisting of replacement of 15m monopole supporting 3 no. antennas with 20m monopole supporting 6 no. antennas and other ancillary development.</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Cole Hodder</b>
<b>Reason for Report to Committee:</b>	<b>A Councillor call-in has been received.</b>

---

## **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 The application has been called in by Councillor David Durant.

## **2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 The site is in commercial use and the proposed development comprises of the replacement of and upgrade to an existing telecommunications base station. The additional visual impacts over that of the existing situation are not regarded as being unacceptable and the proposals would not result in any harm to surrounding residential amenity. Accordingly there are not considered to be any grounds with which to withhold permission.

## **3 RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions to secure the following matters:

### **Conditions**

1. Time Limit 3 years - Development must be commenced no later than three years from the date of this permission.

2. Accordance with plans - The development must not deviate from the approved plans.
3. Hours of construction - 8.00am and 6.00pm Monday to Friday, and between 8.00am and 1.00pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays/Public Holidays.

## **4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS**

### **4.1 Proposal**

- 4.2 Permission is sought for works to upgrade an existing telecommunications base station to facilitate improved 4G coverage whilst making provision also for 5G coverage.
- 4.3 The works proposed consist of a replacement monopole to support 6no. antennas within the shroud at 20m overall height. The proposed monopole is to replace the existing 15m monopole (17.6m overall height to top of antennas) in situ currently which features 3no. antennas.
- 4.4 Aside from the proposed replacement mast, the other ancillary development would relate to the existing equipment at ground level which is within an existing cabinet and formal enclosure on a concrete base.

### **4.5 Site and Surroundings**

- 4.6 The application site comprises of an existing telecommunications base station. Located at the north western corner of the trading estate there is an existing monopole, equipment cabinet and enclosure. The Imperial Trading Estate features a number of commercial units and is accordingly industrial in character and entirely hard-landscaped.
- 4.7 The north western corner of the site where the equipment is located borders Warwick Road which was redeveloped in 2012. The site is bordered almost exclusively by residential properties to the North, East and West through the redevelopment of those sites. To the immediate South on the opposing side of Lambs Lane North the land is designated Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 4.8 The application site itself is not within any area of specific designation.

## **5.0 Planning History**

The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

- 5.1 P1699.04 - Replacement of 15m telecommunication column with new 17.6m lattice tower & relocation of existing O2 equipment plus installation of three no.



3 antennas, no.3 dish, no.1 cabinets and an electric cabinet complete with ancillary feeder's and an extended fence and reinforced concrete base. – **REFUSED**

The proposal, by reason of the height and location of the proposed telecommunications tower, would result in a visually intrusive form of development, which is materially harmful to the visual amenity of the locality and contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV12 of the Havering Unitary Development Plan.

## **6 LOCAL REPRESENTATION**

6.1 A total of fifty-two neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment. In addition the application was advertised in the local press and a site notice was displayed adjacent to the site

6.2 No letters of representation have been received.

The following Councillors made representations:

Councillor David Durant

- Overdevelopment and close proximity to housing

6.3 The impacts of the development on local character and the amenity of neighbouring occupiers will be considered in the following sections of this report which will address the material planning considerations.

6.4 Environmental Health – No objection. Team reviewed the documentation submitted as part of the application and did not raise concerns over noise associated with the proposal. From experience, the risk of telecommunications equipment creating unacceptable levels of noise is considered very low, it was therefore not considered that any additional work from the applicant was required. In the event of a complaint in the future it would be processed under statutory nuisance legislation.

## **7 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:

- Principle of development
- Design and appearance
- Impact on neighbouring amenity and;
- Implications for highways, pedestrian access and parking

### **7.2 Principle of development**

Whilst it is accepted that the site has been the subject of an earlier application which was refused in 2004 due to the visual impacts at that time, the timing of this decision is such that it cannot be afforded significant weight in decision

making. In the intervening period from the decision being taken by the Council to refuse permission the policy landscape has changed significantly. The earlier decision made at the site was made well before the implementation of any current guidance.

- 7.3 With regards to current guidance at both local and national level the growth of telecommunications infrastructure is supported. It is recognised that the expansion of telecommunications infrastructure is essential for sustainable economic growth. In addition to economic growth, advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure is regarded as essential for social well-being. The National Planning Policy Framework requires fundamentally that planning policies and decisions should support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including next generation mobile technology (such as 5G) and full fibre broadband connections.
- 7.4 Guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Local Planning Authorities should aim to keep the numbers of radio and telecommunications masts and the sites for such installations to a minimum consistent with the efficient operation of the network. Policy encourages that existing masts, buildings and other structures should be used, unless the need for a new site has been justified. Where new sites are required, equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate.
- 7.5 In this instance, the proposed site is an existing telecommunications base station with an existing enclosure and monopole. The principle of telecommunications equipment is therefore established. Furthermore the reuse of the site and replacement of existing equipment is regarded as being compliant with the objectives of the NPPF. The NPPF states that applications for telecommunications development (including for prior approval under Part 16 of the General Permitted Development Order) should be supported by the necessary evidence to justify the proposed development. This should include:
- \*\* The outcome of consultations with organisations with an interest in the proposed development, in particular with the relevant body where a mast is to be installed near a school or college or within a statutory safeguarding zone surrounding an aerodrome or technical site; and
- \*\* For an addition to an existing mast or base station, a statement that self certifies that the cumulative exposure, when operational, will not exceed International Commission on non-ionising radiation protection guidelines
- 7.6 Officers are satisfied that the applicant has addressed the above including that appropriate consultations have been carried out prior to submission of the application with organisations with an interest in the proposals, in line with the Code of Best Practice on Mobile Network Development in England.
- 7.7 Health considerations, including perceived fear of health risks can be regarded as material planning considerations. Government guidance states that when determining an application it is for the decision maker to consider how much weight to be afforded to such considerations. In the Government's view, if the

development meets the ICNIRP guidelines for public exposure it should not be necessary for a local planning authority in processing a planning application to further consider health aspects and concerns. The applicant has confirmed that the development when operational would not exceed the International Commission on non-ionising radiation protection guidelines and a Certificate has been provided to that end.

- 7.8 Government advice states that local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for the telecommunications system, or determine health safeguards if the proposal meets International Commission guidelines for public exposure.
- 7.9 Mindful that the proposed development relates to an existing base station and that an ICNIRP certificate has been provided, the proposals are not considered to be objectionable in principle. The visual impacts and other amenity impacts remain to be considered.
- 7.10 **Design and appearance**  
The use of existing masts, buildings and other structures for new electronic communications capability (including wireless) is encouraged by planning policy. Where new sites are required (such as for new 5G networks, or for connected transport and smart city applications) equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate. Policy DC64 of the Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document relates solely to telecommunications development and states that permission will only be granted where it does not result in an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This is reinforced by Policy DC61 which relates to urban design.
- 7.11 The site comprises of an established telecommunications base station that has been in situ for a number of years. It is sited within a commercial environment and whilst bordered by residential dwellings to the North, East and West can be regarded as forming an accepted part of the street-scape. The enclosure at ground level and associated monopole and shroud has for the most part preceded the redevelopment of the surrounding environment. In this instance, the operator has sought to replicate closely the visual appearance of the existing mast.
- 7.12 Whilst the development description indicates that the mast in situ presently is 15.0m in height the current overall height the top of the shroud/antennas is approximately 17.2m. The overall height of the replacement monopole at its highest point would be 20.0m as indicated on submitted drawings. Whilst it is noted that the width of the headframe and support pole would be increased by slightly over one third of the existing width and that this would likely be perceptible, on balance officers do not consider that this would translate to material harm. The overall height increase and increased width would be negligible in the opinion of officers.

- 7.13 Policies D4 (Good Design) and also Policy SI 6 (Digital Connectivity and Infrastructure) of the Mayor's London Plan 2021 are of relevance. Having regard to Policy SI 6 there are no specific design principles with regards to telecommunications infrastructure, only an objective to support the effective use of the public realm to accommodate well designed and suitably located mobile digital infrastructure. This along with Policy D4 are considered to be consistent with the Council's LDF as well as the NPPF.
- 7.14 Whilst it could be reasoned that the replacement monopole would in terms of its proportions, represent an increase over the existing, the overall visual impression is regarded as comparable. It is hard to reason that the siting of equipment in this location of the form shown would give rise to unacceptable harm to local character, particularly were this to be challenged through the appeals process. That the site is an existing base-station weighs heavily in favour of the proposed development.
- 7.15 As such the development is regarded as being compliant with policies DC61 and DC64 of the Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development including telecommunications development does not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development would also align with the aims and objectives of the Framework as outlined in the preceding section of this report and the London Plan 2021.
- 7.16 **Impact on amenity of surrounding residential properties**  
It is not considered that the proposed development would harm neighbouring amenity. Whilst taller than the existing equipment and noted to be more pronounced in appearance it would be difficult to reason that there would be material loss of outlook or unacceptable harm to visual amenity for surrounding occupiers. There furthermore be no unacceptable loss of light, or level of overshadowing, mindful of the existing arrangement.
- 7.17 Consultation with the Council's Environmental Health team did not recommended any suggested conditions on noise grounds. The team concluded that the risk of telecommunications equipment creating unacceptable levels of noise was very low and no additional work from the applicant was required, or considered reasonable. In the event that a noise complaint was received in the future it would be considered against statutory nuisance legislation.
- 7.18 In respect of health issues a Certificate has been submitted with the application which confirms that the proposal complies with ICNIRP guidelines. Government guidance within the NPPF states that local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds and that they should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for the telecommunications system, or determine health safeguards if the proposal meets International Commission guidelines for public exposure.

7.19 The requirement for applications of this type is for the operator to provide a statement that self certifies that the cumulative exposure, when operational, will not exceed International Commission on non-ionising radiation protection guidelines. In this case, an ICNIRP Certificate has been submitted. It is not therefore considered that there are any justifiable grounds to refuse the proposal on health grounds.

7.20 **Implications for highways, pedestrian access and parking**


There are no implications for highway safety. The proposals relate to an existing enclosure and there is no encroachment into other areas of the site beyond the existing defined base station.

**8 Conclusion**

8.1 The principle of telecommunications equipment in this location has been established through the presence of the existing base station and associated. National and local policy supports the reuse of existing sites

8.2 All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

This page is intentionally left blank

 <b>Havering</b> LONDON BOROUGH	<b>Planning Committee</b> <b>23 September 2021</b>
---	---

Application Reference:	P0530.21
Location:	35 Birch Crescent, Hornchurch
Ward:	Squirrels Heath
Description:	Part two/part single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include two roof lights and a rear roof light.
Case Officer:	Seyi Enirayetan
Reason for Report to Committee:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A Councillor call-in has been received which accords with the Committee Consideration Criteria.</li></ul>

---

## 1 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

1.1. The proposed part two/part single storey rear extensions and loft conversion would align with relevant Council guidance. Consequently it cannot be regarded as giving rise to over-development or harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers which could substantiate a decision to refuse permission.

## 2 RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission.

2.1 That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informative to secure the following matters:

### Conditions

1. Time Limit 3 years
2. Accordance to plans
3. Matching materials
4. Flank window condition

## **Informatives**

Approval no negotiation

### **3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS**

#### **Proposal**

3.1. The application is seeking planning permission for:

*Part two/Part single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include two front roof lights and a rear roof light.*

#### **Site and Surroundings**

3.2. The application site is a two storey end of terrace dwellinghouse located on the north side of the street. The property features an existing single storey rear extension. The previous garage to the side has been converted into a habitable room. Vehicle access is provided via crossovers leading to a crazy paved parking area immediately in front of the dwelling providing space for 2 cars.

The street scene along Birch Crescent is generally characterised by a pattern of two storey terraced dwellings featuring gable end roofs and front hard stand car parking or garages. The site has no tree preservation orders or significant constraints.

#### **Planning History**

3.3. P1450.15 was granted planning permission on 22 January 2015. It had sought:

*Proposed double storey rear extension and loft conversion.*

### **4 CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

4.1. The views of the Planning Service are expressed in the MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS section below.

4.2. No consultation was necessary for this type of consultation.

### **5 LOCAL REPRESENTATION**

5.1. A total of 6 properties were notified of the application and invited to comment.

5.2. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc. in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses:

After consultation, a total of 5 no. representations were received, raising objections as well as comments on the application.



Petitions received:

No petition received.

5.3. There were no local groups/societies made representations.

5.4. The following Councillors made representations:

- The proposal was called in by Councillor Melvin Wallace to be determined at a planning committee meeting on the following grounds:
  - The application is considered an over development of the property.

### **Representations**

5.5. The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and they are addressed in substance in the next section of this report.

### **Objections**

5.6. The comments are summarised below:

- Out-of-character
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of light
- Parking and access issues
- Increase in traffic
- Lack of maintenance of the property

5.7. OFFICER COMMENT: These issues are addressed within the body of the assessment as set out in section 6 below ('Material Planning Considerations'). The relevant section to the points above are indicated in the report, and precedes the relevant heading or paragraph.

5.8. It must be noted that officers can only take into account comments that concern relevant material planning considerations.

Neighbouring occupiers also raised objections over the property previously being used in 2015 as HMO use. At the time no evidence was found to suggest that the property is being used as such. However, in the event of the property being sub-divided into separate units, used as a Hotel/Hostel, or as an HMO (there is an Article 4 Direction in place preventing changes to HMO), the Council will investigate and take action if expedient to do so. The current application must be determined on its planning merits based on the scheme that is before the Council. That the application relates to a householder extension to a single dwellinghouse and not for a Hotel/Hostel, HMO or conversion of the property

5.9. In addition, concerns were also raised in regards to lack of maintenance of the property, potential noise and the owners living 6-months in the UK and 6-months abroad. However, these concerns are not of a planning matter.

5.10. Finally, objectors raised concern on the inaccuracy of the plans. Stating that the submitted plans does not show the garage converted. This was communicated with the agent and revised plans have been received. It should be noted that the garage conversion was part of the planning application granted under ref: P1450.15.

## **6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main planning issues raised by the application that the committee must consider are:

- Issue 1 – Design – Whether the proposal is of an acceptable scale/bulk mass or represents overdevelopment of the site.
- Issue 2 – Amenity – Impact on privacy, outlook and light
- Issue 3 - Parking

### **Issue 1**

6.2 Policy DC61 seeks to ensure that new development is of the highest standards of design which respects, and where possible maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area. In particular the form, scale, massing, height of the surrounding neighbouring buildings, public amenity and detailed design.

Havering's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2011 states that, as a general rule, terrace houses can have a single storey rear extension up to 3m depth and 3m height. The single storey rear extension would infill a small section on the eastern elevation to be flush with the existing rear extension which is 3.17m deep with an overall height of 3.15m as a result of the parapet wall. Whilst the depth and height of the proposed rear infill extension would marginally exceed the current guideline, it would nevertheless exhibit subservience. The overall depth and height would integrate appropriately with the character of the garden scene and would relate acceptably to the existing building.

The Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD states that two storey rear extensions to terraced houses are rarely acceptable as they inevitably affect one or both of the adjoining properties. Guidance goes on to suggest that two storey rear extensions should be set in from the common boundary with any attached dwelling by not less than 2 metres and should project no more than 3 metres.

In this case the terraced property is reasonably wide and the proposed two storey rear extension has been designed in accordance with above guidance. It is centrally located and set in from the boundary of both adjoining properties by 2 metres, the proposal is therefore considered to be policy compliant.

It should be noted that the current application is similar to the previously approved scheme (ref: P1450.15) which has now lapsed. The only difference is that the previous application included a rear dormer. This application has removed that element from the proposal and only wishes to convert the existing roof space and install rooflights to the front and rear.

#### Issue 2

The proposed dimensions of the rear extensions is within the acceptable depth of (the residential extensions & alterations SPD) guideline. The two storey rear extension has been set in from both common boundary by 2 meters. This means a reasonable level of amenity will be afforded the neighbours in terms of light and outlook.

There are no flank windows proposed and the rear facing windows of the first floor rear extension is not considered to create a visibility which is unusual to this row of terraces, therefore the proposal is not judged to cause a material loss of privacy or overlooking to surrounding neighbours.

The proposed rooflights are not considered to cause loss of privacy or overlooking to neighbouring properties as they will be facing skyward and there is separation distance as a result of the road.

#### Issue 3

There is no change to the current parking arrangements with two parking spaces at the front on hardstanding, therefore complying with Policy DC33. Thus the proposal is not considered to adversely affect car parking or the use of the highway.

### **Financial and Other Mitigation**

- 6.3 The proposal would not attract the Community Infrastructure Levy contributions as the new floorspace created would be less than 100 square metres.

### **Conclusions**

- 6.4 All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

This page is intentionally left blank