

Application Reference: P0995.22

Location: 5 Albert Mews, Romford

Ward: St Albans

Description: Proposed single storey rear extension, garage conversion, single storey front porch, floor plan redesign and all associated works.

Case Officer: Seyi Enirayetan

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 proposed single storey rear extension, garage conversion, single storey front porch extensions and floor plan redesign 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. SC04 – Time Limit
2. SC10C – Materials as per application form
3. SC32 – Accordance with plans

## **Informatives**

1. Approval - No negotiation required

## **3 LOCATION DETAILS and PROPOSAL**

### **Site and Surroundings**

- 3.1. The application site is a single storey detached dwelling with accommodation in the roof space with an attached single storey garage. There is a detached outbuilding to the rear. The site is accessed off Albert Road via a single track access road with an undercroft entrance located between Nos. 1-4 Albert Mews. There are residential two storey detached, semi-detached and terrace dwellings with rear gardens that back onto the application site.

### **Proposal**

- 3.2. The application is seeking planning permission for:  
*Proposed single storey rear extension, garage conversion, single storey front porch, floor plan redesign and all associated works.*

### **Planning History**

- 3.3. P0175.91 was granted planning permission on 27 June 1991. It had sought;  
*Erection of one detached dwelling with attached garage.*

P0148.14 was refused planning permission on 3 April 2014. It had sought;  
*Canopy porch, garage conversions, external alterations, single storey side/rear extensions and change of use from dwelling (C3) to a preschool (D1 use).*

P0424.19 was refused planning permission on 14 May 2019 and dismissed on appeal 18 September 2019. It had sought; *Retrospective planning permission for 1.8m high metal fence and gate around front part of driveway.*

P2147.21 was granted planning permission on 23 March 2022. It had sought;  
*Single storey rear extension, conversion of integral garage to habitable space, and internal alterations.*

P0800.22 was refused planning permission on 16 August 2022. It had sought;  
*Internal and External changes in Outbuilding.*

## **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 17 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:            2 no. representations were received, raising objections.

Petitions received:                    No petition received.

5.3. No local groups/societies made representations.

5.4. The following Councillor made representations:

- The proposal was called in by Councillor Judith Holt to be determined at a planning committee meeting on the following grounds:
  - The application is considered an over-development of the property.
  - Overlooking/loss of privacy to houses and gardens of numbers 17, 19 and 21 Albert Road and 8 Juliette Mews and 7 and 9 Shaftesbury Road.
  - Loss of light/overshadowing
  - Concerns on how deliveries would be made
  - Noise and disturbance

### **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
- Over-development
- More noise and traffic
- Fire risk
- Overlooking

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.

5.9. In addition, concerns were also raised in regards to noise and disturbance, fire risk and deliveries of building materials and large vehicles manoeuvring safely. These are not material planning considerations and therefore cannot be taken into account in the assessment of the application.

## **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 – Highways and parking issues

Issue 1

6.2 Policy 26 of the Local Plan states that the Council will promote high quality design that contributes to the creation of successful places in Havering by supporting development proposals that are of a high architectural quality and design and are informed by, respect and complement the distinctive qualities, identity, character and geographical features of the site and local area.

Havering's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2011 states that, as a general rule, detached houses can have a single storey rear extension up to 4m depth and 3m height. The proposed single storey rear extensions, as a result of the design of the rear of the host dwelling would have varying depths of 1.4m, 3.1m and 4m. It would have a flat roof and overall height of approximately 2.8m with rooflights. The dimension of the proposed rear extension would be within the current guideline and would reflect the design that provides a sufficient degree of subservience to the main house and will not harm the character of the garden scene.

The single storey front porch extension would align with the front gabled feature of the host dwelling and the change of use of the garage to a habitable space would involve the removal of the garage door and the installation of a new window and brickwork to the side. Given that the materials used would match the existing dwelling, it is not considered that there would be any adverse effect on the host property and surrounding. These alterations are considered modest and would relate acceptably to the existing dwelling and no objections are raised from a visual point of view.

The proposal is therefore considered to be policy compliant.

## Issue 2

The proposal would cause no material impact upon the residential amenities enjoyed by neighbouring properties. The application site abuts the rear garden of No. 8 Juliette Mews. It is not envisaged that the proposed rear extension would result in loss of privacy or loss of light more than existing site conditions.

In terms of the properties along Albert Road and Shaftesbury Road, the dwelling is significantly set back from the boundary of these sites and views of the extension are largely obscured by the host dwelling. Therefore it is not envisaged that there would be amenity impact from the proposed rear extensions to these neighbouring properties.

The front porch extension and alterations facilitated as a result of the garage conversion would not result in significant loss of privacy/overlooking or loss of light due to the separation distance of around 22 metres from properties along Albert Road and 33m from Shaftesbury Road; these distance is well within accepted tolerances, therefore the proposal is not judged to cause a material loss to surrounding neighbours.

## Issue 3

- There is no change to the current parking arrangements and the submitted block plan shows provision of 3 vehicles on site. No highway or parking issues would arise a result of the proposal. It is considered that any car parking issues caused as a result of building works that take place in relation to the proposal would not be so significant so as to warrant a refusal of the scheme.

## **Environmental and Climate Change Implications**

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

## **Financial and Other Mitigation**

- 6.5 The proposal would not attract the Community Infrastructure Levy contributions as the new floorspace created would be less than 100 square metres.

## **Equalities**

- 6.6 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

In this case, the application raises no particular equality issues.

### **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.