



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH

Planning Committee
12 March 2020

Application Reference:	P1881.19
Location:	68 Burlington Avenue Romford RM7 9JL
Ward:	Brooklands
Description:	Single storey rear extension
Case Officer:	Cole Hodder
Reason for Report to Committee:	Reasons of probity. Submission has been made by a Member of the Council.

1. SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 The proposed single storey extension would align with relevant Council guidance. Consequently it cannot be regarded as giving rise to harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers which could substantiate a decision to refuse permission.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. Time Limit 3 years
2. Accordance with plans
3. Matching materials/samples
4. Flank window condition

Informatives

Approval no negotiation

3. PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

3.1 Proposal

- 3.2 The application seeks permission for the construction of single storey rear extension of approximately 3.0m depth. It would feature a mono-pitch roof with an eaves height of 2.52m and overall height of 3.52m. Three roof-lights are shown to the roof-slope.

3.3 Site and Surroundings

- 3.4 The site lies to the western side of Burlington Avenue, close to the junction with Ainsley Avenue. The subject property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling. It is not located within an area of any specific designation.
- 3.5 There is hard standing to the front of the property with a garden to the rear of the property screened by a close boarded fence. The subject property benefits from an historic two storey side extension constructed around the year 2000.
- 3.6 Given that the proposed extension would span the full width of the dwelling encompassing the historic extension, a planning application is required. Having regard to the proportions of the extension, were it contained by the width of the original dwelling the development could have been achievable under permitted development.
- 3.7 For background the applicant had submitted an application for a Lawful Development Certificate, however this was withdrawn once notification had been given by the Planning Service of the conflict with the relevant criteria and confirmation that it would have been recommended for refusal as planning permission is required for the development.

4. Planning History

- 4.1 The following planning decision is regarded as relevant to the current application:

P1290.00 - Two storey side extension – Approved with conditions

5.1 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- 5.2 The following were consulted regarding the application:
- 5.3 Highways – No Objection

Environmental Health – No Objection

6. LOCAL REPRESENTATION

- 6.1 A total of seven neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment.
- 6.2 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 comments received.

7. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 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 host building.
 - The impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers
- 7.2 The depth of the single storey extension would align with the guidance contained within the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). As a general rule, the SPD states that houses can be extended from the rear wall of the original dwelling by up to 3 metres in depth for a terrace house and up to 4 metres in depth for a semi-detached or detached dwelling. This is to ensure the extension is subordinate to the original dwelling and not harmful to neighbouring amenity.
- 7.3 The proposed extension would be three metres in depth from the rear wall of the dwelling. Whilst it would span the full width of the dwelling, encompassing the modest historic side extension, it would nevertheless exhibit subservience. The overall height would be modest and viewed in totality the proposed extension would integrate appropriately with the character of the garden scene and would relate acceptably to the existing building.
- 7.4 Furthermore the proposed development would not be visible from the street scene and therefore no issues arise in this respect
- 7.5 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.

- 7.6 As a semi-detached dwelling, the impacts of the development would be limited to the adjoining attached property. In the case of the unattached neighbour fronting Ainsley Avenue the development would be separated from this neighbour by the length of the rear garden and screened partially by existing development and landscaping to the boundary.
- 7.7 Turning then to the adjoining property, which was observed not to benefit from any form of extension, with the two properties separated by a close boarded fence. Whilst there could be some perceived loss of outlook, and some degree of overshadowing owing to the absence of any form of extension to this property, the impacts would be within acceptable tolerances as the proposed development would be compliant with Council guidance.
- 7.7 It is not considered that the proposed extension would unduly impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties in accordance with policy DC61.

8. Conclusions

- 8.1 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.