

# Delegated Report

## Householder Application for Planning Permission for Works or Extension to a Dwelling

<b>Case Officer:</b>	Harry Moorhouse	<b>Valid Date:</b>	06 January 2021
<b>Officer Recommendation:</b>	<b>Refused</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	03 March 2021
<b>Application Number:</b>	21/00014/HSE	<b>Recommended Date:</b>	17 February 2021
<b>Address:</b>	827 Green Lane, Dagenham, Barking And Dagenham, RM8 1DD		
<b>Proposal:</b>	Construction of a first floor rear extension.		

### Planning Constraints

The application site is located within the Becontree Estate.

### Consultations - None

### Neighbour Notification

<b>Date Consultation Letter Sent:</b>	08/01/2021
<b>Number of Neighbours Consulted:</b>	6
<i>No response received.</i>	

### Relevant Planning History

Application Number:	18/00107/PRIOR6	Status:	Prior Approval Not Required
Description:	Application for prior approval of proposed single storey rear extension (depth: 6.0 metres in total comprising 3.0 metres existing and 3.0 metres proposed; height to eaves: 2.95 metres and maximum height: 3.5 metres).		
Application Number:	18/02253/FUL	Status:	Refused
Description:	Erection of first floor rear extension.		
Application Number:	18/00470/FUL	Status:	Refused
Description:	Erection of single storey rear extension.		
Application Number:	18/00152/PRIOR	Status:	Withdrawn
Description:	Prior approval for an additional 3m to extend to 6m rear extension		

### Development Plan Context

The Council has carefully considered the relevant provisions of the Council's adopted development plan and of all other relevant policies and guidance. Of particular relevance to this decision were the following Framework and Development Plan policies and guidance:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (MHCLG, February 2019)

The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for London (GLA, consolidated with alterations since 2011, published March 2016)	Policy 7.1 - Lifetime Neighbourhoods Policy 7.4 - Local Character Policy 7.5 - Public Realm Policy 7.6 - Architecture Policy 7.8 - Heritage Assets and Archaeology
--	--

*The Mayor of London's Draft London Plan - Intend to Publish version December 2019 is under Examination. Having regard to NPPF paragraph 48 the emerging document is a material consideration and appropriate weight will be given to its policies and suggested changes in decision-making, unless other material considerations indicate that it would not be reasonable to do so.*

Draft London Plan (Intend to Publish version December 2019)	Policy D1 - London's Form, Character and Capacity for Growth Policy D4 - Delivering Good Design Policy D8 - Public Realm Policy HC1 - Heritage Conservation and Growth
Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy (July 2010)	Policy CR2 - Preserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment Policy CP2 - Protecting and Promoting our Historic Environment

	Policy CP3 - High Quality Built Environment
Local Development Framework (LDF) Borough Wide Development Plan Document (DPD) (March 2011)	Policy BP2 - Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings Policy BP6 - Internal Space Standards Policy BP8 - Protecting Residential Amenity Policy BP11 - Urban Design
<i>The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan: (Regulation 19 Consultation Version, October 2020) is at an "advanced" stage of preparation. Having regard to NPPF paragraph 216 the emerging document is now a material consideration and substantial weight will be given to the emerging document in decision-making, unless other material considerations indicate that it would not be reasonable to do so.</i>	
The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 Consultation Version, October 2020)	Policy SP2 - Delivering a well-designed, high quality and resilient built environment Policy SPP6 - Becontree Policy DMD1 - Securing high quality design Policy DMD4 - Heritage assets and archaeology remains Policy DMD6 - Householder extensions and alterations Policy DMNE3 - Nature conservation and biodiversity
Supplementary Planning Documents	Residential Extensions and Alterations (SPD) (February 2012)

## ASSESSMENT

Principle of the Development	
<i>Is the proposed development acceptable 'in principle'?</i>	<b>YES</b>
<i>Officer Comment:</i>	The overriding objective of the local policies is to deliver high quality development which improves the quality and distinctive identity of places and meets the housing needs of existing and future residents. As such, it is acknowledged that extensions to existing family dwelling houses can facilitate additional and enhanced living space for improved living conditions for occupants. They are therefore considered acceptable in principle subject to ensuring a high-quality, neighbourly design. Such matters are addressed below.

Achieving High Quality of Urban Design	
<i>Does the proposed development respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling?</i>	<b>NO</b>
<i>Does the proposed development respect and accord to the established local character?</i>	<b>NO</b>
<i>Is the proposed development acceptable within the street scene or when viewed from public vantage points</i>	<b>N/A</b>
<i>Is the proposed development acceptable and policy compliant?</i>	<b>NO</b>
	<p>The application site is located on the northern side of Green Lane and comprises a mid terrace dwelling house and seeks permission for the construction of a first floor rear extension to which will be constructed atop the existing ground floor rear extension and utilised as an additional bedroom and allow for the construction of a small shower room within the property. Officers note that the plans submitted within this application show there to be an existing ground floor rear extension with a depth of 3 metres, however, when viewing the application site in Google Maps and having looked at the site history, the site appears to have already constructed the extension approved under 18/00107/PRIOR6 for a 6 metre rear extension. Therefore the plans are incorrect and should show the first floor extension to be constructed atop the ground floor 6 metre extension.</p> <p>The proposed first floor rear extension will have a depth of 3 metres with a width of 2.46 metres and a height to eaves of 5.3 metres and a maximum height to the top of the proposed pitched roof of 6.13 metres. The proposed extension will host brick walls, UPVC windows and a tiled roof, Officers do note that whilst the proposed plans state the finish will be brick, the dwelling hosts a rendered finished and therefore would be expected to match this.</p> <p>The NPPF (2019), outlines that decisions should aim to ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of an area not just for the short term, but over the lifetime of the development. It is advised that permission is refused for development of poor design which fails to take opportunities available for improving the character, quality and functioning of an area.</p> <p>London Plan (2016) Policy 7.1 states that the design of new developments and the spaces they create should help reinforce the character of the neighbourhood, with Policy 7.4 requiring development to have regard to the form, function and structure of an area. It is required that in areas of poor, or illdefined, character, new development should build on the positive existing elements to improve the character for the future function of the area. Policy 7.6 seeks the highest quality materials and design appropriate to its context and that buildings and structures should be of the highest architectural quality and complement</p>

the local architectural character. This is echoed by Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy DPD. Policy 7.8 seeks to ensure the significance of London's heritage assets are enhanced and used positively for place shaping and is supported by Policy HC1 of the Draft London Plan. The Draft London Plan (2019) Policies D1 and D4 discuss the need for good design to be thoroughly scrutinised at application stage, including elements relating to layout, scale, density, landuses, materials, detailing and landscaping.

Good design is further supported by policy BP11 of the Borough Wide DPD and Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD6 of the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 Consultation version, October 2020) which requires development to recognise and celebrate local character and use local context to inform detail, materials and landscape. Development which makes a positive contribution to the surrounding area with high quality design, sympathetic to the design of the original dwelling with regards to scale, form, materials, and detailing is supported.

The Becontree Estate, the location of the application site and of which this property forms part, was built as Homes for Heroes in the period 1921 to 1934 and at the time was the largest municipal estate in the world. It therefore forms part of the rich local history of the area and is referenced in Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy as forming an important symbol of the past. Policy CP2 seeks to respect the local context and reinforce local distinctiveness, with Policy BP2 of the Borough Wide DPD referencing the heritage value of the Estate and although this site is not situated in a conservation area, this policy recognises the distinctive local character and historical importance of the Becontree Estate. These policies seek to preserve the instinctive and historically important features of the heritage areas and seek to ensure that developments do not detract from the heritage area's significance, which is further supported by Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide DPD and Policies SPP6 and DMD4 of the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 Consultation version, October 2020). Policy SPP6 has specific regard to the importance of supporting development which contributes positively to the Becontree Estate, where development should preserve and help restore the historic fabric of the estate including the urban 'set pieces' and street types, such as Banjoes, that are unique to the area. Policy DMD4 has regard to conserving and enhancing heritage assets, supporting development which is appropriate in terms of height, scale and massing, form, materiality and detailing and its relationship to the surrounding context. These policies seek to ensure that development is designed in a sensitive and appropriate manner which minimises impact on surrounding neighbours and respects the character of the area.

*Officer Comment:*

The Residential Extensions and Alterations, Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2012) acknowledges that rear extensions are not visible from within the street scene and therefore have limited or no impact on this. However, a rear extension can have a significant impact on neighbouring amenity. With regard to a first floor level extension, the SPD emphasises that the depth of any proposed first floor rear extension, as measured from the main rear wall should not exceed the distance from the proposed extension to the corner of the adjacent property. Therefore no part of a first floor rear extension should extend beyond a 45 degree angle as measured from the corner of adjoining properties. The proposed extension will extend 3 metres beyond the rear wall and will be located 1 metre from the corner of No. 829 Green Lane and 1.71 metres from the corner of No. 825 Green Lane which exceeds the 45 degree angle and as discussed below is unacceptable in regards to both design and neighbouring amenity.

Officers note that a number of dwellings along this terrace along the northern side of Green Lane host ground floor extensions, however, they host uniform roof scapes and Officers are unable to identify any with first floor rear extensions due to the proximity to neighbouring dwellings and the design of the dwelling houses. Therefore, Officers consider the introduction of a first floor rear extension in this location to be unacceptable as the proposed extension is both off-centre and hosts an off centre window which itself fails to respect the character and appearance of the dwelling house. Further, Officers note that this extension would appear discordant when the terrace is viewed from the rear and will be an unsympathetic and uncharacteristic addition to the dwelling which is unacceptable. Further, it is expected within the Becontree Estate and within the borough that any addition contribute to retaining the unique local character which this development does not.

Due to the location of the extension to the rear of the dwelling, Officers do not consider the proposal unacceptable in relation to the view from public vantage points or from the street scene as it will not be visible.

Further, Officers note that the proposed extension is shown to provide an additional bedroom, however, when measuring the floor area of this room it measures 6 sqm which fails to meet the required minimum of 6.5 sqm as outlined within Policy BP6 of the Borough Wide DPD which is unacceptable and will be detrimental to the living conditions of the current and future residents.

When assessing if the development achieves a high quality of urban design Officers consider the proposed first floor rear extension unacceptable as it fails to respect and reflect the existing dwellinghouse and it would introduce an uncharacteristic and unsympathetic addition, harmful to the character of the dwellinghouse and the terrace. The impact on the character of the Becontree Estate identified above adds further weight to the harm caused, as such the proposal is considered contrary to the NPPF (2019), Policies 7.1, 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of The London Plan (2016), Policies HC1, D1 and D4 of the Draft London Plan (2019), Policies CP2 and CP3 of the Core Strategy

DPD (2010), Policies BP2, BP5, BP6 and BP11 of the Borough Wide DPD (2011), Policies SPP6, SP2, DMD1, DMNE3, DMD6 and DMD4 of the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 Consultation version, October 2020) and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD in regards to design.

**Delivering Neighbourly Development**

	Number 825 Green Lane	Number 829 Green Lane	Number 6-12 David Road		Number 825 Green Lane	Number 829 Green Lane	Number 6-12 David Road
<b>Outlook:</b>				<b>Overshadowing:</b>			
Loss from habitable rooms?	YES	YES	NO	Shadow cast into rooms?	NO	NO	NO
Is it unacceptable?	YES	YES		Is it unacceptable?			
<b>Loss of Privacy:</b>				Shadow into garden?			
Overlooking the garden?	YES	YES	NO	Is it unacceptable?			
Is it unacceptable?	NO	NO		<b>Overbearing:</b>			
Overlooking into rooms?	NO	NO	NO	Impact on habitable rooms?	YES	YES	NO
Is it unacceptable?				Is it unacceptable?	YES	YES	
<b>Loss of Daylight:</b>				Impact on gardens?	NO	NO	NO
Loss into habitable rooms?	YES	YES	NO	Is it unacceptable?			
Is it unacceptable?	NO	NO					

**Officer Comment:**

The application site is located on the northern side of Green Lane and comprises a mid terrace dwelling house and seeks permission for the construction of a first floor rear extension to which will be constructed atop the existing ground floor rear extension and utilised as an additional bedroom and allow for the construction of a small shower room within the property. The proposed first floor rear extension will have a depth of 3 metres with a width of 2.46 metres and a height to eaves of 5.3 metres and a maximum height to the top of the proposed pitched roof of 6.13 metres.

The NPPF, The London Plan Policies 3.5, 7.1, 7.4, 7.6, all have relevance to the importance of quality development in addressing neighbouring amenity and avoiding unacceptable impacts. Policy DMD 1 of the Draft Local Plan states that all development proposals should consider the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties with regard to significant over looking (loss of privacy and immediate outlook) and overshadowing (unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight), wind and microclimate. Policy DMD 6 of the Draft Local Plan notes that householder extensions and alterations will need to be designed in a sensitive and appropriate manner, considering the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, avoiding significant over looking (loss of privacy and immediate outlook) and over shadowing (loss of daylight and sunlight). Policy BP8 and BP11 of the Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Plan has specific regard to protecting residential amenity.

Officers have outlined within the design section of this report that the proposed first floor rear extension extends significantly beyond the 45 degree angle outlined by the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD which states that first floor rear extensions have the potential to have a significant impact upon neighbouring amenity. Officers note that the proposed extension is in close proximity to both adjoining neighbours, No. 825 and No. 829 Green Lane and will extend 3 metres to the rear of the dwelling and as such Officers consider that this would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook to both of these neighbours and is considered, due to the depth, height and location to result in an unacceptable feeling of overbearing and sense of enclosure within the neighbouring dwellings.

Due to the orientation of the dwellings with gardens towards the north, Officers do consider the development to result in some losses of daylight, however this is not considered unacceptable. Further, Officers note that the introduction of first floor window further from the rear of the dwelling will cause some increased overlooking, however, there is considered mutual overlooking around the site and as such this is not considered unacceptable.

With regards to the neighbouring dwellings along David Road, due to the separation distances and location of these dwellings the proposed development is not considered unneighbourly to these properties.

As such, Officers consider the proposal to be unacceptable and contrary to the NPPF, Policies 3.5, 7.1, 7.4, and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Plan, Policies DMD1 and DMD6 of the Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 Consultation version, October 2020) and the criteria set out by the Residential Extension and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document in regards to neighbouring amenity.

#### Delivering Sustainability

<i>Does the proposed development promote or enhance biodiversity?</i>	<b>NO</b>
<i>Has established vegetation been preserved or appropriately relocated/mitigated against?</i>	<b>YES</b>
<i>Officer Comment:</i>	Although the application has not incorporated any biodiversity enhancement measures, the proposed development would not impinge on the garden space of the property and would therefore have no overall impact on the biodiversity value of the site.

#### Meeting the Needs of Homeowners

<i>Are all proposed rooms well-lit by daylight and naturally vented through opening windows?</i>	<b>YES</b>
<i>Are the sizes of all proposed rooms appropriate in size for the purpose they are designed for?</i>	<b>NO</b>
<i>Officer Comment:</i>	The proposed extension is shown to provide an additional bedroom, however when measuring the floor area of this room it measures 6 sqm which fails to meet the required minimum of 6.5 sqm as outlined within Policy BP6 of the Borough Wide DPD.

#### Other Material Considerations

None.

#### CONCLUSION

The proposed development fails to respect the character and appearance of the area introducing a discordant, poorly located and poorly designed development which is unsympathetic and uncharacteristic of both the dwelling house, terrace and wider Becontree Estate. The location of the dwelling within the Becontree Estate adds further harm. In addition the proposed development results in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties, particularly to No. 825 and No. 829 Green Lane in regards to causing unacceptable overbearing and sense of enclosure and loss of outlook. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to the Development Plan policies and guidance specified above, and it is recommended that planning permission be refused.