
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2017

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/17/3179894

16 Patricia Drive, Hornchurch RM11 3RU

- 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 Francesco Cardone against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0237.17, dated 13 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch at 19 Patricia Drive, Hornchurch RM11 3RU, in accordance with the terms of application ref: P0237.17, dated 13 February 2017.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application forms indicate that permission is being sought retrospectively and indeed I noted at my site visit that the porch has already been built. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
3. The Council is concerned that the submitted plans contain inaccuracies and I note that there is a disagreement between the parties as to the precise height of the porch. However, it is clear that permission is being sought for the porch as built. Other matters of concern to the Council, including the extent of the hardstanding, are not indicated on the application form nor were they considered during the application process. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on the basis that it relates to the porch only.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. 16 Patricia Drive is a two-storey detached house with a hipped roof, finished in a mix of brick and render. I understand from what I have read that it is, in effect, a remodelled building which has been extensively altered. The main part of the dwelling now projects further forward than the original structure. Nevertheless, the house is set a considerable distance back from the highway, slightly forward of the neighbouring property No 18, a semi-detached

- bungalow, and some distance back from No 14, also a semi-detached bungalow.
6. The surrounding area is a well-established residential area comprising buildings of a variety of styles generally set on consistent building lines, behind front gardens and drives.
 7. Policy DC61 of the Council's Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008 (DPD) requires new development to maintain, enhance or improve the character and appearance of a local area. Paragraph 7.2 of the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2011 (SPD) sets out criteria for determining proposals for residential porches.
 8. The porch that forms the subject of the appeal is a relatively small structure compared to the scale of the house. It is approximately 2.5m wide and is single storey in height, extending upwards to the bottom of the first floor window. As such the porch is not an overly dominant feature and moreover it is in proportion with the host dwelling. No features of importance on the property are disguised or lost. Fenestration details align with those of the front elevation and the design and materials of the porch, which has a hipped roof, reflect those of the existing property. Consequently the porch does not appear out of character with the host dwelling and the structure meets the requirements of the SPD.
 9. As set out above, dwellings in the area are of a variety of styles. Features including porches, projecting gables and bay windows with lean-to or hipped roofs are not unusual on the front elevations. As such, the porch in itself does not appear incongruous in the street scene. Moreover, given the set-back of the property from the road behind the predominant building line, the porch is not dominant or visually intrusive in the street scene.
 10. For these reasons the development does not cause undue harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling or that of the surrounding area. Consequently the proposal meets the requirements of Policy DC61 of the DPD in that it maintains the character and appearance of the area.

Conditions and Conclusion

11. The Council has suggested certain conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed which I have considered in light of the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. As the application is retrospective it is unnecessary to specify the time commencement condition or the approved plans.
12. The Council has suggested a condition restricting any openings on the flank elevations to those shown on the submitted plans. However, windows are already shown on both side elevations and as such a condition is unnecessary in order to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.
13. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR