



| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 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">A Councillor call-in has been received which accords with the Committee Consideration Criteria. |

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.