
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2016

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/16/3152311

51 Acacia Avenue, Hornchurch, Essex RM12 4EW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Lisa Cuthbert against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0275.16 was refused by notice dated 25 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and rear extension.
-

Costs

1. An application for costs was made by Miss Lisa Cuthbert against the Council of the London Borough of Havering. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

3. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, adjoining terrace and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within a primarily residential area where two-storey rear extensions are a characteristic of the rear garden environment.
 5. The proposal includes a two-storey side and rear extension. The Council has not raised concern regarding the side extension part of the proposal. The proposed first floor rear extension would extend across part of the existing rear elevation. It would be some 5.9 metres in width. This would exceed the main two-storey part of the existing house width, which is some 5.65 metres wide. I note that recent planning permissions for rear extensions in the vicinity of the appeal site have been for proposals of less width than the proposal before me.
 6. Guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2011) advises that rear two-storey extensions should be carefully designed to minimise their bulk and that extensions should be subordinate to the host dwelling.
-

7. From my observations, due to the width and bulk of the proposed rear first floor extension, I consider that it would overwhelm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and it would appear unacceptably dominant in this rear garden environment. It would be larger in scale and bulk than neighbouring rear extensions, creating an incongruous addition to the property. This would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling, terrace or rear garden environment.
8. For the above reasons and having taken into consideration all matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, adjoining terrace and surrounding rear garden area. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to guidance in the Council's SPD and Policy DC61 in the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008), where they seek to maintain, enhance or improve local character. I consider that Policy DC61 is broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework as far as it meets the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR