

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2017

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/17/3175203

42 Stanley Road, Hornchurch RM12 4JN

- 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 Bobby Hilton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P2066.16, dated 1 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension and the construction of a single/part double storey rear extension, an infill front extension with a bay window, the reconfiguration of internal layout and the erection of an outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension and the construction of a single/part double storey rear extension, an infill front extension with a bay window and the reconfiguration of internal layout. I allow the appeal in so far as it relates to the erection of the outbuilding at 42 Stanley Road, Hornchurch RM12 4JN in accordance with the terms of application P2066.16, dated 1 December 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-5522_01 and PL-5522_07.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair of houses and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house with a hipped roof. It is located in a residential street that primarily comprises semi-detached houses of similar size but varied detailed design. The property has been extended to the side to create a garage at ground floor level with a bedroom above. Whilst this addition detracts from the appearance of the property and the street scene, due to the set back upper level and flat roof it is clearly subordinate to
-

the original building. As a consequence the original arrangement of the pair of houses remains evident, a matter to which I attach significant weight.

4. The proposal would include the erection of a 2-storey side addition above which the hipped roof would be expanded. The extension would follow the existing front building line and a double-height bay formed to match the existing on the other side of the entrance. If viewed in isolation this would create a pleasing frontage. However, when viewed in the context of the semi-detached pair of houses the result would be a more lop-sided composition than is currently the case due to the prominence of the extension.
5. Due to its siting and bulk I therefore conclude that the proposed side addition would be an overly dominant and incongruous addition that would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the semi-detached pair of houses and the street scene. For these reasons the proposal fails to comply with Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008) which, amongst other matters, seeks development that responds to distinctive local building forms and patterns of development and respects the scale, massing and height of the surrounding physical context. There is also clear conflict with the aims of the Council's Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.
6. I note that there are nearby properties that feature 2-storey side additions. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits and in accordance with current planning policy I attribute limited weight to the properties referred to by the appellant.
7. As the proposed outbuilding, which at the time of my visit was at an advanced stage of construction, would be a relatively modest structure located at the rear of a long garden I am satisfied that it would not result in any unacceptable effects on the appearance of the area or on neighbours' living conditions. As this element is clearly physically and functionally separate from the extension to the house a split decision allowing this element can be issued. The proposed rear additions to the house are not physically and functionally severable from the side addition so this part cannot be approved in isolation.

Conditions

8. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. Although I note that the outbuilding is at an advanced stage of construction, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring it to be constructed in accordance with the approved plans is imposed.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail in respect of the extensions to the house but succeed in respect of the erection of the outbuilding.

S Poole

INSPECTOR