



<b>Application Reference:</b>	<b>P0106.19</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>39 &amp; 41 Reed Pond Walk</b>
<b>Ward:</b>	<b>Romford Town</b>
<b>Description:</b>	<b>Pettits</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Cole Hodder</b>
<b>Reason for Report to Committee:</b>	<b>Reasons of probity. The agent is employed by London Borough of Havering and is a relation of the applicant.</b>

---

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

- 1.1 The proposed development concerns the replacement of a pair of garages located between nos. 39 and 41 Reed Pond Walk. The proportions of the replacement garages would be broadly comparable to that of the existing which are noted to suffer from subsidence. Having carefully considered the development proposals officers consider that the replacement of the existing garages would present no issues visually, nor present any concerns from the perspective of neighbouring amenity owing to the joint nature of the application made. The development would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of either of the subject dwellings, nor the wider Gidea Park Conservation Area. Officers consider that there would be insufficient grounds to withhold planning permission.

## **2 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to conditions to secure the following matters:
- 2.2 That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

## **Conditions**

1. Time Limit 3 years
2. Accordance with plans
3. Matching materials/samples

## **Informatives**

1. Approval no negotiation

## **3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS**

### **3.1 Proposal**

- This application seeks permission for the demolition of a pair of garages and the construction of replacement garage units. The form and appearance of the garages would be comparable to the existing units and is necessitated by subsidence.

### **3.2 Site and Surroundings**

- Nos 39 and 41 Reed Pond Walk are residential dwellings located within the Gidea Park Conservation Area. Both properties are two storey 1911 Exhibition houses.

### **3.3 Planning History**

- There is no planning history relevant to the current proposals.

## **4 CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

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

4.2 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- Gidea Park and District Civic Society – No comments received

## **5 LOCAL REPRESENTATION**

5.1 A total of nineteen neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment. The application was also advertised in the local press and a site notice was displayed adjacent to the site.

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: No representations received.

## **6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

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

- The impact of the development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- The impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers

### **6.2 The impact of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider Conservation Area**

- The application site is located in the Gidea Park Conservation Area and as such, the general consideration would be whether the new development would preserve or enhance its character and appearance.
- The statutory duty applied to planning authorities in the exercise of their planning functions in conservation areas is set out in section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This is that "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area". This aim is reflected in Policy DC68. The Conservation Area comprises a number of houses which were constructed as part of the 1911 House and Cottage Exhibition and a further exhibition of Modern Homes in 1934. Over the years the Council has sought to preserve the character of the area firstly through the designation as a Conservation Area in 1970 and later through the adoption of an Article 4 Direction to remove permitted development rights.
- Whilst the proportions of the replacement garages would be increased over that of the existing the increase would be negligible in the opinion of staff. The proposed garages would occupy the existing front building line however would project deeper into the rear garden environment by just in excess of 1.30m. Viewed from the front there would be a minor increase in height when viewing the garages between nos. 39 and 41 Reed Pond however the roof form would be comparable to that of the existing and views from the public realm would be limited given the siting of the garages set back considerably from the road frontage. The provision of new openings in the flank wall of the structure is not considered to present any concerns given the location of those openings relative to rear garden of each of the subject premises respectively.
- The bulk and massing of the garages is considered to be proportionate to the size and scale of the rear gardens of the subject dwellings. It is not

considered that the replacement structure and the design approach adopted would give rise to a discordant or harmful feature in terms of character. It is considered that the replacement garages would preserve the character and appearance of the host dwellings and would not give rise to any harm to the spacious, garden suburb character of the Gidea Park Conservation Area. The development therefore complies with Policy DC68 of the Core Strategy.

### **6.3 The impact of the development on neighbouring occupiers in terms of residential amenity.**

- Policy DC61 states that planning permission will not be granted where the proposal results in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/ daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy to existing properties.
- The amenity considerations arising from the current proposals would be negligible. The siting of the garages and joint nature of the application eliminates any potential for amenity impact. As with the earlier section of this report, the scale and form of the garages is considered to be appropriate and there are no implications relating to visual amenity to be considered.

### **Conclusions**

- 6.7 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.