



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2019

by Neil Smith BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/19/3230893

95 Station Lane, Hornchurch, Essex RM12 6JU

- 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 David Gooderham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1480.18, dated 1 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension and rear dormer to facilitate the enlargement of Nos 95 and No 97 and to create an additional residential flat at loft level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council have confirmed that they determined the application in relation to the revised plans. Three of the application plans have been renumbered and are as follows: 2018.150.01i - Location Plan; 2018.150.04i - Proposed Plans; and 2018.150.05i - Proposed Elevations. I have determined this appeal in relation to those plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal on (i) the character and appearance of the area and (ii) the living conditions of the future occupiers of the flat in respect of internal storage and floorspace and outside amenity space.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached property which contains two self-contained residential flats. It is located on a prominent corner with Florence Close. The appeal property has a garden area which wraps around the property to the front, rear and side. There is also a space for one car to park at the rear of the property.
5. Station Lane has a mixture of residential and commercial uses. The buildings are two storeys in height and are of a varied design. Florence Crescent, which is next to the appeal property, is a short residential cul-de-sac which has two-

- storey dwellings. These properties are similar to the appeal property in terms of design, scale and materials. The dwellings are set back from the pavement edge and have front garden areas giving the area a pleasant open character.
6. The appeal proposal seeks to enlarge the property through the addition of a two-storey side extension which would have windows at the ground and first floor levels. The side extension would also introduce a new eaves level to the front elevation as it would be set back from the main building line. The proposal also includes a rear dormer window including the raising of the height of the existing roof. Together these extensions would increase the size of the existing residential units whilst also creating an additional flat at first floor and roof level.
 7. I find that the two-storey side elevation would bring the building closer to the pavement edge on Florence Close thereby reducing the sense of openness. The creation of a new ridge line and a new eaves level to part of the front elevation would significantly unbalance this pair of semi-detached properties. I also find that the new windows would be out of line with the existing windows and would be at odds with the appearance of the host property.
 8. I note that whilst the proposed rear dormer window would be set in from the sides and back from the rear wall, it would take up virtually the entire roof plane. In addition, as the height of the roof would be raised to accommodate the additional living space, the roof of the dormer window would be higher than the ridge line of the adjoining property. I saw from my site visit that there are no other comparable dormer windows of similar size and bulk scale in the surrounding area. I find that the development would appear as unduly prominent and incongruous additions on this corner property.
 9. Whilst I note that the proposal would be constructed in materials to match the existing building, I still find that the development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.
 10. I conclude that the development does not accord with Policies DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008 (DPD); the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD) and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2016. Collectively, these policies seek to ensure new development enhances and improves the character and appearance of the local area.

Living conditions – gross internal floorspace and internal storage

11. The proposed plans indicate that the new dwelling would have an entrance hall and stairs at first floor and further living accommodation within the roof with a gross floorspace of 50 square metres. The proposal would not accord with the Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standards 2015 (Space Standards) for a one bedroom, two persons dwelling with accommodation provided over two storeys. Furthermore, the Space Standards also require additional storage to be provided within bedrooms. The appellant claims that this could be accommodated with the eaves, but this is not shown on any of the plans.
12. I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the Space Standards and the living conditions requirements of Policies DC03 and DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies

Development Plan Document (2008) (CS); the Residential Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (SPD) and Policies 3.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016). This is a matter which weighs against allowing the appeal.

Living conditions – outside amenity space

13. I note that the amenity space for each of the three dwelling meets or exceeds the minimum requirements and that there would be shared amenity space to the front of the property. Whilst I note that the private amenity space for unit three would be in the form of an elongated an “L” shaped configuration and behind a wall I find that overall the amenity space provision would be both useable and of sufficient size.
14. I conclude that the outside amenity space proposed would accord with Policies DC03 and DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008) (DPD) and the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (SPD) and Policy 3.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which together seek to ensure good design in new housing developments.

Other matters

15. The proposed development would seek to boost the supply of housing sites in the area. However, the contribution to supply from only one dwelling would be a limited benefit in the overall planning balance. This would not outweigh my conclusion on the main issues.

Conclusion

16. Whilst the proposal would be acceptable in terms of the amount of outside amenity space that would be available for occupiers of the residential units, I have found that when the proposal is considered as a whole, significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, I have found that the proposal would not accord with the requirements of the Space Standards and significant harm would be caused to the living conditions of the future occupiers of the additional dwelling.
17. For the latter reasons, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Neil Smith

INPSPECTOR