

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/W/16/3153360

1 Grange Road, Romford, Havering, Essex RM3 7DU

- 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 Mr Rajeev Arora against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0374.16 dated 10 March 2016 was refused by notice dated 24 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor side and rear extension and basement extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:

the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and

the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular reference to privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site lies in a prominent location at the end of a parade of commercial properties. It lies adjacent to a school playing field. To the rear is a row of two-storey residential properties.
 4. The proposal includes a flat roof rear extension to the side and rear of the existing property, covering a considerable extent of the site. It would have a stepped down flat roof reaching a maximum of some 4.7 metres in height. The rear addition would measure some 11.37 metres in depth, with the side addition filling the small gap to the side of the property.
 5. From my observations, due to the bulk and excessive depth of the proposal, together with the extent of site coverage, I consider that the proposal would appear as an excessively disproportionate addition to the host property. In addition, it would be out of scale with the scale of development in the rear
-

area. In this prominent location, it would be visible to a considerable extent from open public views. For these reasons, I consider that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Living Conditions

6. Rear windows for a kitchenette and a hall would face the side of the adjacent residential premises at 1 Archway. Due to the local topography, the proposed rear extension would be in an elevated position in relation to the rear gardens of the residential properties in Archway.
7. The proposed windows would not be to habitable rooms and the existing vegetation on the boundary of 1 Archway and the presence of a garage on that boundary would limit views across the rear gardens of properties in Archway. For these reasons, I do not consider that the proposal would materially affect the living conditions of neighbours, with regard to loss of privacy.

Conclusion

8. On reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised. Whilst I have found that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbours, I have found that it would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This harm is of a significant level to dismiss the appeal. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DC61 in the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008), where it seeks to maintain, enhance or improve local character, although it would accord with this policy where it seeks to protect residential amenity.
9. I consider 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; and should be seeking a good standard of amenity for all existing occupants of land and buildings.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR