



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH

Planning Committee

7th July 2022

Application Reference:	P0324.22
Location:	73 & 75 The Grove, Upminster
Ward	Upminster
Description:	Erection of part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension to 73 and 75 The Grove. Single storey front porch extension to 73 The Grove and alterations to fenestration/openings.
Case Officer:	Aidan Hughes
Reason for Report to Committee:	A Councillor call-in has been received which accords with the Committee Consideration Criteria.

1 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 The proposal would be acceptable and relate acceptably to the existing dwellings and not have an unacceptable impact on the rear garden environment.
- 1.2 It is considered that the proposal would not result in material harm to neighbouring amenity. No material amenity issues or parking and highway issues are considered to result.

2 RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to suggested planning conditions:
- 2.2 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. SC04 – Time limit
2. SC10 – Matching materials
3. SC32 – Accordance with plans.
4. SC46 – Standard Flank Window Condition.
5. SC48 – Balcony condition

Informatives

1. Party Wall Act.
2. INF28 – No negotiation required.

3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Site and Surroundings

- 3.1 The application site is located on The Grove. The site contains a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellings. There is parking on the drive to the front of the property. It is noted that both dwellings have benefited from hip to gable roof alterations and rear dormer windows under permitted development.
- 3.2 The surrounding area is characterised by single and two storey dwellings of various styles and designs.

Proposal

- 3.3 Planning permission is sought for the construction of a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension to 73 and a first floor rear extension at No.75 The Grove. In addition, a single storey front porch extension is proposed to 73 The Grove and alterations to fenestration/openings.
- 3.4 It is noted that No.75 The Grove has commenced works on their first floor rear extension which forms part of this application. Any works undertaken without the relevant consent is done so, at the risk of the applicant of No.75 The Grove and may be liable to enforcement action depending on the outcome of this application.

Planning History

- 3.4 The following planning decisions are relevant to the application:

No.73 The Grove, Upminster

D0014.22 - Certificate of Lawfulness for loft conversion with rear dormer – Planning Permission not required.

No.75 The Grove, Upminster

Y0404.21 - Single Storey rear extension with an overall depth of 6m, a maximum height of 3m, and an eaves height of 2.70m – Prior Approval Given.

P1895.21 - Two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and conversion of existing bin store and utility area to habitable space – Approved with Conditions.

4 CONSULTATION RESPONSE

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

4.2 Consultation of Statutory Consultees were not required.

5 LOCAL REPRESENTATION

5.1 A total of 7 neighbouring properties were notified about 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: 1 received, objecting to the proposal.

5.3 The following Councillors made representations:

Councillor Wilkes and ex-Councillor Ower have called in the application on the grounds that:

By requesting to go full width of the plot on all boundaries with no gap between number 73 and number 75, this would severely impact the view of the semi-detached houses in this part of the street (and will make the house at number 77 appear as part of a set of terraced houses). The double storey side extension and roof would attach at all floors (between number 73 & 75) and has no separation or roof design difference.

Representations

5.4 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

- Enclosing the gap between the properties.
- Terracing effect with no gap or roof design difference.
- Proposal will create a terraced group of properties, no terraces in street.
- Proposal would unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair.
- Loss of garden space due to the extensions.
- Loss of privacy due to over-looking.
- Proposal will be over-development and be dominant & visually intrusive.
- Proposal will be out of character with the street and rear garden.
- The proposal goes well beyond the current building lines of the street.

Non-material representations

5.5 The following issues were raised in representations, but they are not material to the determination of the application:

- Loss of view by enclosing the gap between the properties.

OFFICER COMMENT: A loss of view is not a material planning consideration.

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

- The visual impact arising from the design and appearance of the building on the area.
- The impact of the development on neighbouring amenity.
- Highways and parking issues.

6.2 Visual impact arising from the design/appearance on the area.

- No objections are raised to the porch extension from a visual point of view. The depth of the front extension at No.73 would be less than the 1m normally permissible.
- The application dwellings have benefited from a-hip to gable roof alterations and rear dormer window under permitted development. As previously mentioned, the Council do not have any control over this form of development as long as the proposal meets the relevant criteria.
- As such due to the works under permitted development, the pair of semi-detached properties have been unbalanced already as the attached neighbours have hipped roofs over their individual dwellings.
- The proposed first floor side extension would be set back 1m to comply with Council guidelines. The proposal has been designed with a gabled roof to mirror the new gabled roof constructed under permitted development, so they mirror the same roof design.
- It is considered that it would be difficult to substantiate a refusal on appeal due to the unbalancing effect, mindful that the pair of semi-detached properties have already been unbalanced by the works completed under permitted development.
- The 1m set back from the front wall of the dwelling would create a break in the roof-line between the dwelling with its newly constructed gabled roof and the proposed first floor rear extension. This set back and lower roof line would prevent the properties being viewed as having a terracing effect.
- A flat plateau would be behind the pitched roof of the extended garage when viewed from the front. The proposed gabled roof two storey side extension at No.73 would relate acceptably to the existing dwelling and no objections are raised from a visual point of view.
- It should be noted that No.75 The Grove has completed the works for their two storey side extension which was approved as part of planning consent P1895.21.

- The development would also be visible from the rear garden. The extensions in the form of the ground and first floor rear extension would relate acceptably to the existing property and it is considered the proposal would not unduly impact on the rear garden environment, as the proposal would be of an acceptable design and will relate well with the existing dwelling in terms of bulk, scale and massing.
- No objections are raised to the Juliette balconies from a visual point of view as they would only be visible from the rear garden environment.
- As a result, it is considered that the proposed development would not unacceptably impact on the street scene or the rear garden environment and no objections are raised from a visual point of view.

6.3 The impact of the development on neighbouring amenity

- Consideration has been given to the impact on neighbouring dwellings in terms of loss of light and loss of privacy.
- The proposed front extension would be well removed from the boundary with No.71 not to have an impact on their amenity and it would be screened by the neighbouring extensions at No.75 The Grove so as not to impact on their amenity.
- The two storey side extension would be located on the south-east side of the dwelling. It is not envisaged that this part of the proposal would have any impact on the amenity of the attached neighbour at No.71 The Grove as they are located to the north-west and the first floor side extension would be located on the opposite side of the dwelling, well away from this neighbour.
- It is noted that No.75 The Grove has obtained approval for their two storey side and single storey 6m deep rear extension as part of planning application P1895.21.
- No.71 has a single storey rear extension which would mitigate the proposed 6m rear extension at No.73. The neighbouring rear extension at No.71 is 85cm deeper than the conservatory at No.73 which is going to be demolished. As such, the rear extension at No.71 has a depth of approximately 2.9m. An overall projection beyond No.71's single storey rear extension of approximately 3.1m is not unusual and is envisaged within guidelines as acceptable when considering the impact of a 4m deep extension on the boundary with a neighbour that has not previously extended.
- The proposed roof light on top of the ground floor rear extension of No.73 The Grove would be sufficiently removed from the sides of the extension, not to unacceptably impact on the adjacent neighbours.

- As such, it is considered that the neighbouring single storey rear extensions at No's.71 and 75 would mitigate the depth of the proposed ground floor rear extension at No.73 The Grove.
- The 3m deep first floor rear extension complies with Council guidelines. It would be set off the common boundary with No.71 by approximately 3.45m. It is noted the proposed first floor rear extension would not infringe upon a notional line taken from common boundary with No.71 The Grove at first floor level created by a 2m separation distance and the 3m depth of the extension, this is due to the separation distance between the boundary and the extension.
- The first floor rear extension at No.75 which is also being proposed as part of this application would mitigate the proposed first floor rear extension at No.73.
- It is considered that the proposal would not result in any undue overlooking or loss of privacy above existing conditions, particularly as the first floor windows of neighbouring properties already overlook the rear garden areas of surrounding residential properties.
- Given these circumstances and mindful of the general presumption in favour of development, it is considered any impact upon the adjacent neighbours to be modest and within that envisaged as acceptable within guidelines.
- The installation of flank windows on or close to the boundary are discouraged, as these windows claim light from exclusively outside of the site over land which a resident has no control. In such circumstances, the Local Planning Authority cannot undertake to safeguard the entry of light to the flank windows on the adjacent extension. To safeguard the privacy of the adjoining neighbours, two conditions have been imposed to ensure that no openings will be added to the side of the proposed extensions or that the flat roof of the rear extension would not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area, unless specific permission is obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority.

6.4 **Parking and Highway Implications**

The application site is within a PTAL area of 1a. As per The London Plan 2021 Policy T6.1 that for a site within Outer London PTAL 0 - 1 that has 3 plus bedrooms, the site only needs to provide a maximum parking provision of up to 1.5 spaces per dwelling, which is what the application sites are able to provide.

No highway or parking issues would arise as sufficient parking would be provided in line with guidance.

Environmental and Climate Change Implications

- 6.5 Given the limited scale of the proposals, no specific measures to address climate change are required to be secured in this case.]

Financial and Other Mitigation

- 6.6 The proposal would not attract Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to mitigate the impact of the development as the development would be less than 100 square metres.

Equalities

- 6.7 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

- 6.8 The application, in this case, raises no particular equality issues.

Conclusions

- 6.9 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.