



Application Reference:	P0645.20
Location:	2, Cornwall Close, Hornchurch RM11 3HA
Ward:	Emerson Park
Description:	Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey end of terraced 3 bedroom dwelling incorporating single storey rear extensions and off street parking to land adjacent.
Case Officer:	Victoria Collins
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. This report considers an application for planning permission for residential development of a brownfield site currently housing a flat roof single storey garage to provide a 3bed 4person dwelling.
- 1.2. The site lies outside the Metropolitan Green Belt, Employment Areas, Commercial Areas, but within a predominantly residential area. The application would have a public benefit which is the delivery of housing in the borough.
- 1.3. The development would be of a high architectural quality with height and design appropriately responding to local context, safeguarding the character and appearance of Cornwall Close, to provide a standard residential accommodation. The development would not have an unacceptable impact on the streetscene or the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the highway road network.

- 1.4. Although the existing front garden soft landscaping would be replaced with hardstanding for parking purposes, this is the prevailing pattern of front garden in surrounding area, as the street is typified with forecourt parking.
- 1.5. However, the proposed development would provide some level of landscape to the forecourt, details of which could be achieved via condition if minded to approve, to soften the appearance of site and maintain the character of site.
- 1.6. Subject to the recommended conditions, the proposal would constitute sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. The application is in accordance with the provisions of the Development Plan and there are no other material considerations which would indicate that it should be refused.

## **2 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1. That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to the suggested planning conditions.

### **Conditions**

- 1) The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans (as set out on page one of this decision notice).
- 3) All building operations in connection with the construction of external walls, roof, and foundations; site excavation or other external site works; works involving the use of plant or machinery; the erection of scaffolding; the delivery of materials; the removal of materials and spoil from the site, and the playing of amplified music shall only take place between the hours of 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, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 4) No relevant works shall take place in relation to any of the development hereby approved until samples of the external finishing materials, which shall match those of the existing building(s) are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter the development shall be constructed with the approved materials.

5) No building shall be occupied until cycle storage is provided in accordance with details on drawing number 201 Rev 2 hereby approved. The cycle storage shall be permanently retained thereafter.

6) Before the buildings hereby permitted is first occupied, details of the forecourt layout including a scheme for the provision of both hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include permeable materials for the hard standing surfaces. The approved details shall be implemented as agreed and retained permanently thereafter.

7) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, - or any other development order repealing or amending the said Order - other than porches erected in accordance with the Order, no extension or enlargement (including additions to roofs) shall be made to the new dwellinghouse hereby permitted, or any detached building(s) erected, without the express permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

8) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, boundary treatment shall be provided in accordance with details of all proposed walls, fences and boundary treatment which shall have previously been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The boundary development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained permanently thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

9) The dwelling hereby approved shall comply with Regulation 36 (2)(b) and Part G2 of the Building Regulations - Water Efficiency.

10) The dwelling hereby approved shall be constructed to comply with Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations - Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings.

### **Informatives**

1) Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: In accordance with paragraph 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019, additional information on the forecourt layout details were sought from the agent; who provided an additional amended plans, though details not provided.

2) The proposal is liable for both the Mayor of London Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and the Havering Council CIL. The Mayoral CIL levy rate for Havering is £25.00 per sqm and is chargeable for each

additional square metre of residential gross internal floorspace(GIA). Based upon the information supplied with the application, £10,350 would be payable due to result in a new residential property with 69 sqm of GIA, however this may be adjusted subject to indexation.

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

#### **Proposal**

- 3.1. The application is seeking planning permission for:  
*Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey end of terraced 3 bedroom dwelling incorporating single storey rear extension and off street parking to land adjacent.*
- 3.2. The proposed building would be two storey, and have an eaves height of approximately 4.8m, a maximum height of approximately 7.7m, a total width of approximately 6m, and a depth of approximately 10.5m.
- 3.3. The proposed dwelling including the host property would have two off-street car parking spaces, waste and refuse storage and cycle storage, as well as their own private rear gardens of 40sqm in area for each house.

#### **Site and Surroundings**

- 3.4. The site is located on the south-eastern side of Cornwall Close at its junction with Berkshire Way.
- 3.5. The site includes a semi-detached single family dwelling with an existing single storey side garage. Site is not located within any conservation area, and the host property is not listed.

#### **Planning History**

- 3.6. None.

### **4 CONSULTATION RESPONSE**

- 4.1. The views of the Planning Service are expressed in section 6 of this report, under the heading "MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS".
- 4.2. The following were consulted regarding the application:

#### **LB Havering Street Management (Highways)**

- 4.3. No objections to the scheme.

#### **LB Havering Waste and Recycling**

- 4.4. No objections to the scheme.

- 4.5. "Waste and recycling sacks will need to be presented by 7am on the boundary of the property, facing Cornwall Close, on the scheduled collection day."

**LB Havering Environmental Protection Officer**

- 4.6. No objections to the scheme on contamination grounds.

**Anglican Water Services Ltd**

- 4.7. No comments received.

**Essex and Suffolk Water**

- 4.8. No comments received.

## **5 LOCAL REPRESENTATION**

- 5.1. A total of 10 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment.
- 5.2. The number of representations received from neighbours and members in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:
- 5.3. No of individual responses: 51, of which, 51 objected.
- 5.4. A petition in objection with 55 signatures from 43 addresses was received, objecting on the following grounds:
- Not compatible with the appearance of the street nor surrounding area.
  - Loss of light and privacy
  - Possible loss of parking to the surrounding area.
- 5.5. The following Councillors made representations:

Councillor Bob Perry and Councillor Roger Ramsey objecting on the following grounds:

- Out of character with surrounding area.
- Height and closeness to the walkway would impact on the streetscene.
- Possible loss of light and overshadowing to neighbouring residents.
- Possible loss of privacy to occupiers of the proposed dwelling.
- Increased noise and disturbance from an additional dwelling.
- properties have no driveway parking spaces, therefore the proposals would exacerbate the parking situation on site and surrounding area, given the limited on-street parking spaces.

- Existing issues with the refuse lorries, emergency services and delivery lorries, due to the narrowness of the road.
- Possible issues with sewage.

### **Representations**

- 5.6. 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**

- Point 1 – Impact on the appearance of the street and surrounding area – out of keeping.
  - Point 2 – Impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of light and privacy.
  - Point 3 – Increased noise and nuisance from the additional dwelling.
  - Point 4 – Concerns over parking issues; specifically the loss of existing parking bay fronting the host property.
  - Point 5 – Semi-detached house into a terrace, limiting the value of houses, bank may recall mortgage loan.
  - Point 6 – Safety and accessibility issue for motorists and pedestrians at the junction close to site – visibility issue.
  - Point 7 – Disruption, dust and noise during construction.
  - Point 8 – Other vehicles parking on the grass verge to be fined.
  - Point 9 – Restricting Emergency services getting to the end of the road with possible visibility issue and the narrowness of the road.
  - Point 10 – Overdevelopment of site; increase in crime and burglaries.
  - Point 11 – Possible strain on the existing schools; lack of infrastructure in the area.
  - Point 12 – Loss of the existing greenery to the front of site.
  - Point 13 – Restrictive covenant – not to use the forecourt area for parking.
  - Point 14 – Excessive rear extension to the host property, finishing of the side wall.
  - Point 15 – Party wall agreement; construction hour condition; noise/music from workmen on the site.
  - Point 16 – No need for more houses; overpopulation of the area.
- 5.7. OFFICER COMMENT: The local residents' concerns are noted. The material planning considerations highlighted above would be addressed within the body of the assessment as set out in section 6 below ('Material Planning Considerations').
- 5.8. Other issues raised in respect of devaluation of properties, vehicles parking on the verge to be fined; restrictive covenant on site; overpopulation; mortgage loan and party wall issues are not considered to the material considerations and will not be considered in this report.

## **6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

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

- Principle of Development
- Built Form, Design and Street Scene Implications
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- Transport
- Financial and Other Mitigation
- Other Planning Issues

### **Principle of Development**

6.2. New housing utilising brownfield (previously developed) land is generally supported by policies of the Development Plan.

6.3. The NPPF and Policy CP1 of the Local Development Framework support the increase in the supply of housing in existing urban areas where development is sustainable. Policy DC61 states that planning permission will not be granted for proposals that would significantly diminish local and residential amenity.

6.4. The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The London Plan notes the pressing need for housing and the general requirement to improve housing choice, affordability and quality accommodation. The London Plan also (Policy 3.4) states that development should optimise housing output subject to local context and character.

6.5. On 13 February 2020 the Government published the 2019 Housing Delivery Test (HDT) results. The results show that within the London Borough of Havering, 33% of the number of homes required were delivered over the three year period of 2016-17 to 2018-19. Therefore the tilted balance referred to in Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is triggered until such a time as the new Local Plan is formally adopted as it details an alternative method for calculating delivery.

6.6. The above results indicate that the delivery of housing within the borough has been substantially below the housing requirement over the past three years. As a result, 'The presumption in favour of sustainable development' at paragraph 11 d) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF) is relevant.

- 6.7. Fundamentally this means that the borough will need to deliver more housing, and therefore current proposal should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.
- 6.8. The proposed development would contribute to the housing supply and delivery within the borough, and this would weigh in favour of the development.
- 6.9. However, one of the caveats in paragraph 11d) of the NPPF refers to planning balance, and by this the NPPF aim is for development to be well designed and integrates well into its surroundings.
- 6.10. Therefore subject to further assessment the development is not opposed in principle, providing that the proposal is acceptable in all other material respects.
- 6.11. The site currently consist of an existing single storey flat roof garage, the loss of the garage would not impact on the road networks. Further highways assessment would be discussed under the 'Highways' section.
- 6.12. Overall, the proposal would be considered to be an effective use of land to comply with the London Plan policy 3.4 and would therefore be considered acceptable.

#### **Built Form, Design and Street Scene Implications**

- 6.13. There are similar developments in the area in terms of character, it is acknowledged that the prevailing pattern of development in term of housing typology in the area is semi-detached.
- 6.14. The current proposal would result in the change of the appearance of site from semi-detached dwelling to a short terrace of three dwellings, this would not comply with the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which normally seeks a subordinate approach, but in this case of a totally new dwelling, it is preferable to continue the building line so that the group of dwellings has a consistent appearance. This approach would not be considered to be out of character with site and surrounding area, given similar short terraces on Rutland Drive and at the junction of Essex and Berkshire Way in close vicinity of site.
- 6.15. The minimum proposed gap between the proposed dwelling and the pavement would be 1m, this would comply with the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).



- 6.16. The proposals would further respect the appearance and character of site in terms of both the material choice and roof forms, which would be compatible to and in-keeping with the wider surrounding area.
- 6.17. In addition, the building line of the host property would be respected, which would allow the proposed dwelling to be set back from the front of the site, and retain the open nature character of the streetscene.
- 6.18. The bulk, scale, height, massing and the spaces around the proposed dwelling would be in-keeping with the character and context of the area, considering the overall feel of the streetscene.
- 6.19. The proposed dwelling would not appear cramped within the plot and within the context of the streetscene, rather, it would be considered to sit comfortably within its own plot.
- 6.20. Given the proposed boundary treatment and planting, the proposals would be considered not to be harmful to the streetscene. The existing landscape to the front of the host property (no.2) would be altered to provide adequate parking facility to the host property, the forecourt arrangement would include some level of landscaping to soften the appearance of the forecourt, and to assist in the integration of the development within the streetscene.
- 6.21. Currently the whole area located to the front of the existing garage is hardstanding area, while current proposals would provide planting along common boundaries and areas not occupied by vehicle parking, to provide some relief to the existing harsh urban environment and assist with on-site stormwater management. Permeable materials would also be required for the hardstanding surface, this along with the soft landscaping details can be achieved via appropriate landscaping condition.
- 6.22. The proposed dwelling would meet the internal space standards as set out in policy 3.5 (and Table 3.3) of the London Plan, and the Technical Housing Standards, would have an acceptable floor to ceiling height, dual-aspect accommodation with suitable amounts of ventilation and outlook, and is of a suitable size for the level of proposed occupancy. The garden spaces for both the host property and the proposal would be of acceptable size which would be regular, easy to use, and practicable for future occupants. The location would be to the rear, similar to the established pattern of other properties in the area.
- 6.23. The proposal would be required to comply with the Building Regulations (Part M), making it accessible to all.

- 6.24. There would be the provision of a new single storey rear extension to the host property, this would be of an acceptable scale and would be similar to other extensions in surrounding area, would provide an additional useable space to the host property.
- 6.25. The location of the waste and refuse storage would be acceptable, and practicable for future occupants, given the side access provision. The Council's Waste Management have raised no objection. If required, it could be located to the front of site.

#### **Impact on Neighbouring Amenity**

- 6.26. The site lies on the south-eastern side of Collier Close, and is set back from neighbouring properties and the boundaries of their own site. The closest house is the donor property (No.2 Collier Close), the proposal would be identical to no. 2 in scale, height, design and material with all its windows facing the rear of site, therefore no undue impact on their residential amenity.
- 6.27. To the east of the site is no. 1 Berkshire Way, the flank wall of which backs onto the application site. It is acknowledged that the proposal would sit forward of the front building line of no. 1, Berkshire Way, however, given the separation distance of approximately 7m at the ground floor level and 10m at the first floor level; the location of garage on the shared boundary with the application site and the orientation of site (south of no. 1 Berkshire) it would be considered that the resulting impact on their amenity in terms of light, overshadowing and outlook would not be significantly different from as it currently exist on site from no.2. Given that the windows are located facing the rear of site, similar to the existing window at no. 2 Cornwall Close and not be closer to no.1 Berkshire than at it currently exist, therefore no additional loss of privacy is envisaged.
- 6.28. To the south of site are properties fronting Berkshire Way with a standard road width between the site and these properties. The property directly facing the flank wall of the application site (no. 18 Berkshire Way) would be separated from the site by approximately 17m, this would be considered acceptable with no undue impact on their amenity.
- 6.29. The closest distance to the side of the proposed dwellings boundary adjoining Berkshire Way of the proposed dwellings is 1.02m, this would be similar to the breathing space surrounding other properties in surrounding area. In addition, given the layout and the separation distance with the neighbouring properties, the proposals would not directly impact any private amenity space. Furthermore, the roof forms lessen the visual mass and built form at roof level, consequently, the proposed dwelling would have an

acceptable impact on daylight, sunlight, outlook and sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties.

- 6.30. The proposed single storey rear extension to the rear of the host property (no. 2) would be a modest extension at 3.3m deep, set in some 0.2m away from its boundary with the adjoining property no.4, and would be 2.3m at eaves and 3.2m maximum height with a sloping roof. It is noted that the proposal would adjoin the habitable room of no.4 based on the application site layout and Google image, however, the modest scale of extension would be considered acceptable with no significant impact on the residential amenity of neighbours in terms of light, outlook and sense of enclosure. The proposed materials as indicated would be red facing brick to match the existing, therefore no significant visual impact is envisaged. The proposal would also comply with the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 6.31. The increase in the number of residential units and occupants in this area would not increase the amount of noise or disturbance to neighbouring properties to an unacceptable level. The noise consultee did ask for additional noise insulation on the proposed dwelling. Given that, the only identifiable source of noise would be from occupants using their garden area, there is no justifiable reason for imposing any condition.

### **Transport**

- 6.32. The site has a Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) of 1b (very poor), and given the size of the proposed dwelling house, it would be reasonable to assume that any future occupants would rely on private vehicles. The proposals would provide two car parking spaces each to both the host property and the new dwelling. The quantum and design of the parking provided is acceptable and practicable to overcome residents' concerns in terms of the loss of the existing parking bay on site, as it is noted that some of the properties in immediate vicinity of site provides no on-site car parking.
- 6.33. The proposals include dedicated cycle parking space located to the rear of site, to comply with the sustainable mode of transport promoted by policies of the Development Plan in general. An appropriate compliance condition would be imposed, if minded to approve, to ensure the provision in line with the London Cycle Design Standards as proposed and retain thereafter.
- 6.34. It is noted that the site is a corner plot, however, the proposed development would not have any adverse impact on the width of the road as raised by a concerned resident. The proposal would not impact on the visibility at that corner, given the substantial set back from the road and set in from the side boundary of site.

- 6.35. It is acknowledged that the existing bay on the pavement fronting the host property will be lost, this would be similar to any other property seeking a driveway on Cornwall Close. The proposal would result in the loss of one parking bay to provide 2 car parking spaces to the host property. In addition, the proposed crossover would not ordinarily require planning permission. However, as it has been submitted as part of this proposals, an assessment has been carried out. The Highways Officer has been consulted and raised no objection. Therefore the crossover is acceptable.
- 6.36. This section of Cornwall Close is subject to bays only pavement parking restrictions. Given that the proposal would provide adequate parking on site, it would not be considered to exacerbate traffic or parking issue on site. Therefore, the loss of the parking bay would not justify a refusal of planning permission.
- 6.37. Although the Highways has not raised any comments, however, in terms of parking provision, the proposals would be considered to comply with the Local Development Framework policies DC32 and DC33.

#### **Financial and Other Mitigation**

- 6.38. The application proposes new residential unit, and new floor space of approximately 69sqm. The application would attract the following Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to mitigate the impact of the development:
- £8,625 LB Havering CIL
  - £1,725 Mayoral CIL
  - Total = £10,350
- 6.39. The scale and density of the proposed development is within the requirements of policy DC2 of the Local Development Framework.

#### **Other Planning Issues**

- 6.40. In terms of the impact on the existing sewage, Essex Water Company was consulted with no comments received, therefore, given the scale of development, it would not be considered to significantly impact on the existing facility. However, applicant would be advised to contact the water supplier for the site via an informative.
- 6.41. The LB Havering Environmental Protection team have raised no concerns regarding the scheme.
- 6.42. There is the possibility under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 as amended - or under any subsequent Development Order – for the houses as proposed to be altered,

enlarged or otherwise changed, therefore, it would be necessary to limit the ability of any alteration or enlargement of the proposed developments by imposing a condition on any grant of planning permission.

- 6.43. The noise, vibration dust and general disruption during construction will be unavoidable, however this would be for a limited time and would be controlled via an appropriate working hour condition with the use of music on site to reduce possible impact.
- 6.44. Concerns raised with regard to possible strain on existing schools is noted, however, the scale of the proposed single dwelling is likely to have a negligible impact on the existing schools in close vicinity of site. In addition, the CIL payment could be used for the provision of additional classrooms or improve the existing facilities within the available schools to mitigate the impact of the development.

## **7 Conclusions**

- 7.1. Officers consider the application acceptable on its own merits. However, if the Planning Committee intend to refuse the application then consideration would need to be given to the implication of this.
- 7.2. All other relevant policies and considerations have been taken into account. It is recommended that planning permission be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION section of this report (section 2).