



**Havering**  
LONDON BOROUGH

## **Planning Committee**

**14 August 2025**

<b>Application Reference:</b>	<b>P0035.25</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>13 Wallenger Avenue, Romford</b>
<b>Ward:</b>	<b>Squirrels Heath</b>
<b>Description:</b>	<b>Retention of Existing Outbuilding</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Kelvin Naicker</b>
<b>Reason for Report to Committee:</b>	<b>A Councillor call-in has been received which accords with the Committee Consideration Criteria</b>

---

### **1 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION**

- 1.1** The design of the rear outbuilding is considered acceptable and does not have a detrimental impact on the rear garden environment.
- 1.2** Furthermore, the use, scale and sitting of the outbuilding is not judged to result in material harm to the neighbouring amenity.

### **2 RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1** That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission subject to:
- 2.2** That the Director of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

#### **Conditions**

1. SC32 – Accordance with Plans
2. SC33 – Incidental Use
3. SC46 – Flank Window Condition
4. INF28 – Approval No Neogotiation Required

### **3 PROPOSAL AND LOCATION DETAILS**

#### **Site and Surroundings**

- 3.1** The application site features a two storey detached residential dwellinghouse.

It benefits from a two storey rear extension as well as an outbuilding in the rear garden environment, subject to this application.

The site does not contain any listed buildings nor is located within a conservation area.

#### **Proposal**

- 3.2** Planning permission is sought for the retention of the existing outbuilding within the site.

The outbuilding measures approximately 4m wide, 13.3m deep and up to 2.9m high at its maximum point.

The outbuilding also benefits from an attached canopy which measures approximately 3m high and projects approximately 3.8m deep.

#### **Planning History**

- 3.3** P2138.03 – Two Storey Rear Extension (Approved with Conditions)

#### **Enforcement History**

- 3.4** ENF/227/24 – Without planning permission, the construction of an outbuilding

### **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 four 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

**5.3** The following Councillor made representations:

Councillor Christine Vickery wishes to call-in this planning application on the following grounds:

- Backland development
- Overdevelopment of site which is not in keeping with area
- Not in keeping with special character of area
- Loss of privacy
- Noise and disturbance issues
- Dominating impacts on its surroundings and nearby properties

Officer Comment: The property is not located in any designated character area

**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:

- Concern that building occupies two thirds of the garden area
- Concern that the outbuilding would set precedent for the road.

**Procedural Issues**

**5.5** No procedural issues were raised in the representations as part of this application.

**6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

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

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**

On outbuildings, the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document states that:

"The outbuilding should be subordinate in scale to the existing dwelling and to the plot. In assessing proposals, the Council will consider factors such as the scale, height, proximity to boundaries, roof design, finishing materials and

prominence in the street scene or rear garden environment. As with all extensions, outbuildings should not detract from the character of the area and should be unobtrusively located to the side and rear of the existing dwelling".

Paragraph 9.6 goes on to say:

"The design of outbuildings should reflect their intended use. Outbuildings should not cause undue loss of light to neighbouring properties or adversely affect the living conditions of neighbouring properties".

The development is not considered to constitute as a backland development because the outbuilding is located within the rear garden environment of a residential dwellinghouse and is in use in connection with the dwelling.

Consideration has been given to the overall proportions, siting and design of the outbuilding in-situ.

The rear garden area is approximately 335 square metres in area, with the footprint of the outbuilding and canopy occupying approximately 53 square metres, which equates to less than one sixth of the garden area. Whilst it is acknowledged that the outbuilding is larger than others along Wallenger Avenue, given the deep and spacious rear garden within which it sits (approximately 26m in depth), it is not deemed to appear disproportionately large in relation to the overall size and spaciousness of the rear garden site.

Therefore the outbuilding is not considered to constitute an overdevelopment of the site and is instead considered acceptable from a design standpoint.

### **6.3 The impact of the development on neighbouring amenity**

Consideration has been given to the impacts of the outbuilding on neighbouring amenity, particularly in terms of loss of light, outlook and privacy.

Given its bulk, scale and massing, it is not considered that the outbuilding has a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties either side of the application site.

It is not considered that the outbuilding gives rise to overlooking or loss of privacy. Its flank wall closest to the common boundary with no. 15 Wallenger Avenue does not benefit from any windows and whilst there are windows within its flank wall located opposite the shared boundary with no. 11 Wallenger Avenue, the separation distance between that wall and the shared boundary (over 7m) coupled with the close boarded fence along this boundary means it is not considered that they give rise to overlooking or loss of privacy. A condition preventing the formation of any other windows or other openings within the flank walls of the outbuilding will be imposed in the event the application is approved to prevent loss of privacy.

All other neighbouring properties are considered to be sufficiently separated from the outbuilding such that it does not cause a detrimental impact on their amenities.

The submitted plans indicate that the outbuilding is used as a gym/playroom, including a shower/wc. These uses are considered to be incidental to the dwellinghouse and it is not considered that any activity, noise and disturbance emanating from the outbuilding as a result of these uses would be so harmful to the amenity of neighbouring occupants so as to warrant a refusal of the application.

In the event this application is approved, a condition will be imposed requiring the use of the outbuilding approved to remain incidental to the dwellinghouse.

#### **6.4 Parking and Highway Implications**

No highways or parking issues are considered to arise from the development.

#### **6.5 Environmental and Climate Change Implications**

It is noted there is a tree within the curtilage of no. 15 Wallenger Avenue in close proximity to the shared boundary of the site and there are also two trees at the rear of the application site behind the outbuilding. Council records indicate that these trees have no statutory protection and it is not judged that there are material grounds to refuse planning permission based on the impacts of the outbuilding on trees within or near the application site.

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

#### **6.6 Financial and Other Mitigation**

The proposal would not attract Community Infrastructure Levy contributions to mitigate the impact of the development as the floorspace of the outbuilding is less than 100 square metres.

#### **6.7 Equalities**

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**

- 6.8** 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.