



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH

Planning Committee
7th April 2022

Application Reference:	P1403.21
Location:	58 Heath Drive, Romford
Ward	Pettits
Description:	Part single storey, part two 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 Permission has already been granted for a part single, part two storey rear extension. The proposals concern a minor increase of the approved ground floor as well as alterations to openings at ground floor. The visual impacts are limited, as are the amenity impacts and in light of the minor increase in depth it is concluded that there are insufficient grounds to withhold permission.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Assistant Director Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

1. 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).
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, no window or other opening (other than those shown on the submitted and approved plan,) shall be

formed in the flank wall(s) of the building(s) hereby permitted, unless specific permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

3. The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Informatives

1. That the Committee confirms that it has paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Gidea Park Conservation Area(s) as required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

4 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Site and Surroundings

- 4.1 The site lies to the western side of Heath Drive and forms part of the Gidea Park Conservation Area. The site comprises a two storey detached property. The subject premises is not an exhibition house however is flanked by 57 Heath Drive (1911) and 60 Heath Drive (1934) which are both examples of exhibition properties.

Proposal

- 4.2 Consent is sought retrospectively for a part two storey, part single storey rear extension. The proposals were previously approved by the Planning Committee under reference P0329.18 at the committee meeting held November 22nd 2018.
- 4.3 A condition requiring submission of materials prior to commencement was not discharged ahead of the development commencing, therefore given the extent of works undertaken it is necessary to consider the proposals as built.
- 4.4 The extension has been constructed largely in accordance with the approved drawings, with the exception of an increased depth at ground floor (approximately 30cm per submitted drawings) and the omission of bi-folding doors and use of sliding panels as an alternative.
- 4.5 The extension is rendered to match the existing dwelling as had been envisaged when granting the earlier consent and original windows and frames were reinstalled at first floor level as had been required from the earlier grant of consent.

Planning History

- 4.3 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:
P0329.18 – Part single, part two storey rear extension
Approved and development implemented

5 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

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

5.2 The following were consulted regarding the application:

5.3 Consultee (Non-statutory) – Heritage Advisor

- Preference for pitched roof addition, however accepts consent has been granted and established through the extant approval ref P0329.18. No further comments.

5 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

5.1 A total of three neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment. The application has been publicised by site notice displayed in the vicinity of the application site and it has also been publicised in the local press.

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: Two of which, two objected

Petitions received: No petitions received

5.3 No local groups/societies have made representations to the Council.

Representations

7.5 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

Breach of earlier planning consent

Discrepancies on drawings and in submitted application forms

Detrimental to light and aesthetics of Conservation Area

Scale, bulk and mass inappropriate

8 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

Conservation Area/design and impacts on neighbouring amenity

8.2 The application site is located in the Gidea Park Conservation Area and as such, the general consideration would be whether the development would preserve or enhance its character and appearance. This is a fundamental consideration and one present in national and local planning policy.

8.3 In light of the scale of the extension which was granted permission, the proposals amount principally to the consideration of the additional depth at

ground floor level which amounts to an increase of approximately 300mm based on submitted drawings. The provision of sliding doors as opposed to bi-folding doors is not of any consequence and would not amount to any precedent.

- 8.4 Decision making has held that visibility does not equate to the absence of harm particularly in the Gidea Park Conservation Area. In this case the first floor and most prominent element of the proposals has been constructed in accordance with the approved plans. The ground floor element would be visible from adjacent rear gardens as well as to some extent over longer distances from higher level windows. However at an increased depth as is shown on submitted plans would be difficult to oppose.
- 8.5 Council guidance does not preclude against extension which exceed 4.0m in depth on detached houses and where they are proposed they are considered on their own merits. The impacts on neighbouring amenity arising from the additional depth at ground floor would not present as objectionable in planning terms as there would be compliance with Council guidance through either the setting back of the extension from the shared boundaries of the site, or an extension of a depth which would mitigate the harm arising. Accordingly through complying with Council guidance there would be no adverse impacts in planning terms on neighbouring amenity.
- 8.5 In the absence of any material harm to amenity the acceptability of the proposals rests on the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area/host property. Having regard to the approved scheme, officers do not consider that there would be sufficient harm through the additional depth over that approved to withhold permission. In reaching this view officers are mindful of an appeal scenario and are conscious in particular of the absence of any material amenity impacts in planning terms.
- 8.7 There are no requirements under the CIL regulations owing to the limited floor area created.

Equalities

- 8.8 The Equality Act 2010 provides that in exercising its functions (which includes its role as Local Planning Authority), the Council as a public authority shall amongst other duties have regard to the need to:
- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited under the Act;
 - Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- 8.9 The application, in this case, raises no particular equality issues.

Other Planning Issues

8.10 The act of breaching consent is not of itself a material consideration and works as continued on site were undertaken at the risk of the applicant.

Conclusions

8.11 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.