
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by Simon Warder MA BSc(Hons) DipUD(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/17/3177559

2 Copthorne Gardens, Hornchurch, Essex RM11 3DL

- 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 Stephen Deans against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0045.17, dated 12 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension over existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling which is prominently located at the corner of Copthorne Gardens and Wingletye Lane. An attached single storey garage is set in a short distance (less than 1m) from the side boundary. Nevertheless, in the Wingletye Lane street scene, the garage sits considerably forward of the fronts of the adjoining bungalows on the north side of Copthorne Gardens and the two storey dwelling adjoining Tyrsal Close to the south.
 4. The proposed extension would extend the external dimensions of the existing garage to first floor level and have a gable roof facing Wingletye Lane. It would, therefore, add significantly to the height and bulk of the part of the building which projects forward of the Wingletye Lane building line. Consequently, the extended building would be unduly prominent in the street scene.
 5. I recognise that the front wall of the extension would be set back from the front of the existing building and that the ridge line of the roof would be lower than the property's main roof. The extension would also use complementary materials and detailing. To this extent, the extension would be subservient to the existing building. Nonetheless, these characteristics would not prevent it from projecting forward of the Wingletye Lane building line and would do little to minimise its prominence in the street scene.
-

6. The appellant has referred to the variety of built form in the area. However, I have not been made aware of any side extensions that are as prominent as the appeal proposal.
7. Consequently, I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with Policy BE61 of Council's Core Strategy and Development Control Policies 2008. Among other things, this policy requires development to maintain or enhance the character of the area and respond to local building forms and patterns of development.
8. Nor would the proposal accord with the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2011 insofar as it advises that the flank wall of corner extensions should be set back at least one metre from the back edge of the footway and not project forward of the building line of properties along the adjoining street.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has made reference to the National Planning Policy Framework. However, there is no substantive evidence to indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR