



Havering
LONDON BOROUGH

Planning Committee

7th July 2022

Application Reference:	P0291.22
Location:	37 Corbets Avenue, Upminster
Ward	Upminster
Description:	Two storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension
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

It is considered that the proposed extensions would not unacceptably impact on the character of the immediate vicinity. The proposal is acceptably designed, would integrate well with the existing dwelling and will not unduly impact upon the street scene or the immediate garden scene. It is viewed that the proposed extensions would not unacceptably impact on the amenity of the adjacent residents in terms of overshadowing, loss of light and loss of privacy. There is no impact on highway safety and off road parking guidelines are met.

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 an informative 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. Land Ownership
2. Party Wall Act.
3. INF28 - Approval following revision

3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS

Site and Surroundings

- 3.1 The application site houses a detached residential two storey dwelling house with a single storey extension to the rear and a single storey side/rear garage. The front garden is block paved to provide off-street car parking. The property is not listed, nor is it within a conservation area. No trees will be affected as a result of this proposal. The surrounding area is residential in nature, containing mainly semi-detached and detached properties. There are various extensions in close proximity.

Proposal

- 3.2 The applicant is seeking planning consent for a two storey side, part single/ part two storey rear extension.

Planning History

L/HAV 495/71 – Porch – Approved.
L/HAV 6577/72 – Ground floor rear extension - Approved
L/HAV 875/74 – Carport – Approved.

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 5 neighbouring properties were notified about the application and invited to comment.
- 5.2 The number of representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 3 of which, 1 objected and 2 supported

Representations

5.3 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:

- Concerns that the proposal would lead to overdevelopment.
- Creation of a terracing effect and a spoilt visual aspect of the street scene.
- The extension built up to the neighbouring property would be inappropriate.

Supporting comments: Two emails in support of the proposal.

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

- Design and the impact on the street / garden scene
- Impact on the amenity of the residents of the neighbouring properties
- Impact on the highway and parking
- Environmental and Climate Change Implications

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

- The Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Havering Local Plan Policies 7, 24 and 26 have been used to assess this application.
- The proposed hip roofed two storey side extension would be up to the boundary with No.35 Corbets Avenue which sufficient spacing being provided to allow for a gutter detail down the side between the extended dwelling and this neighbour.
- No.35 Corbets Avenue will project forward of the application dwelling at ground floor level but the proposed development would not project forward of the neighbouring dwelling at No.35 at first floor level.
- Council guidelines outline for detached houses that the approach taken will depend on the architectural style of the house, its relationship to neighbouring dwellings and the character of the street. Side extensions to detached houses may be constructed to the full height of the existing building, provided they appear as an integral part of the original house rather than an unrelated addition.
- The application site has access to rear of the property on either side of the application dwelling.

- It is noted that the proposal would enclose the gap which currently exists between Nos.37 and 35. However, the proposed hipped roof design over the first floor side extension and the flat roof over No.35's first floor extension will help to alleviate this. This side extension would not leave any spacing at first floor level to the side boundary, however, there are other similar extensions nearby (for example at 35 Corbets Avenue) and there are staggered building lines. It is considered that there are insufficient grounds to refuse this application on this basis.
- The development would also be visible from the rear garden. The extensions in the form of the ground and first floor rear extensions would relate acceptably to the existing property.
- The cumulative depth of the proposed rear extension and the existing rear extension would be 8.8 metres from the rear wall of the original dwelling, exceeding the recommended 4 metres in the guidance outlined within the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD. It is acknowledged that a depth of 8.8 metres is large, however, part of the extension would replace an existing single storey side/rear garage (that will be demolished as part of this application) and the proposal would not extend any further than the existing garage.
- The depth of the first floor rear extension would comply with Council guidelines with the roof design being sympathetic to the existing dwelling, so it would not appear unduly bulky from the rear garden or obliquely from the street scene when approaching the dwelling from Parklands Avenue.
- 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 its bulk, scale and massing.
- 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 Impact on the amenity of the residents of the neighbouring properties

- Consideration has been given to the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring properties, primarily in respect of overshadowing, loss of light and loss of privacy.
- It is considered that the proposed extensions would not unacceptably impact on the amenity of the adjacent residents. The two storey rear extension will be set in 2m from the boundary with 35 Corbets Avenue and is a sufficient distance away from the dwelling at 10 Parkland Avenue to have minimal impact on its amenity.
- It is noted that the two openings at No.35 adjacent to the boundary with the application site are a door at ground floor level to the garage and an upper window which serves a bathroom. Both of these are considered to be non-

habitable areas and therefore, less weight is applied to the impact of the proposal on them.

- No.35 has a flank window in their ground floor rear extension which is a secondary light source, as additional light is provided from the rear elevation. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not unacceptably impact on the amenity of these windows.
- It is noted that that the proposal would project 3m beyond the rear elevation of the side extension at No.35 and then encompasses the footprint of the existing garage. It is acknowledged that the proposed single storey rear extension would not meet the guideline in Section 5.3 of the SPD which states that 'any greater depth required should be within an angle of 45 degrees, taken from the 4 metre dimension on the property boundary, in order to ensure a reasonable level of amenity is afforded to neighbouring properties'. However, the extension would replace an existing side/rear detached garage building and the proposal would not create any further loss of amenity in comparison. It is considered that it would be difficult to demonstrate the additional harm, mindful of the position of the existing side/rear detached garage building.
- The proposed first floor side extension would project approximately 45cm beyond the rear extension of No.35 at first floor level. The 3m deep first floor rear extension complies with Council guidelines. It would be set off the common boundary with No.35 by approximately 2.25m. It is noted that the proposed first floor rear extension would not infringe upon a notional line taken from common boundary with No.35 Corbets Avenue 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.
- It is acknowledged that the rear extension would create a wall along much of the rear boundary with 10 Parkland Avenue but it would be difficult to refuse for this reason alone, especially as the height of the extension is only 3m and the extension would be approximately 24m away from the dwelling house at 10 Parkland Avenue.
- Furthermore, mindful that the proposed first floor rear extension would be set off the boundary with No.10 Parkland Avenue by approximately 1m and the fore mentioned separation distance between this neighbouring dwelling and the proposal, it is considered that it would be difficult to substantiate a refusal on appeal on a loss of amenity to this neighbour.
- There are no concerns of loss of light to the neighbouring houses. No flank windows are proposed and therefore no loss of privacy would arise.
- 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.
- To safeguard the privacy of the adjoining neighbours, two conditions have been imposed to ensure that no openings will be added to 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
- Overall, the development is considered to fall within the guidelines in the Supplementary Planning Guidance (Adopted 2011) for householder extensions and the proposal is not deemed to be unneighbourly.

Impact on the highway and parking

- 6.4 The proposal will impact on the parking within the site with the loss of a garage and some parking. The front garden has hardstanding for off-road parking for at least 2 cars and therefore no highway or parking issues would arise. Policy 24 of the Havering Local Plan requires at least 1.5 spaces per 3+ bedroom unit; this is met.

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 Given the limited scale of the proposals, no specific measures to obtain financial agreements are required to be secured in this case.

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

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

Conclusions

- 6.8 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.