The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019

**by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 13th November 2019**

**Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/19/3234383**
**2 Dewsbury Road, Romford RM3 8DW**

- 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 B Luxton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
- The application Ref: P0772.19, dated 16 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2019.
- The development proposed is a two-storey side extension to create new one-bedroom dwelling house.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. The submitted plan detailing the existing elevations includes a rear dormer. Having visited the site, it is apparent that the existing building does not feature a rear dormer. As the plan showing the proposed elevations does not feature any form of dormer, I have proceeded on this basis.

## Main Issues

3. The main issues are:

   - the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area; and

   - whether suitable living conditions would be provided for the future occupiers of the development.

## Reasons

*Character and appearance*

4. The appeal site consists of a two-storey terraced house. Most of the surrounding dwellings are constructed to similar proportions and heights. This gives the surrounding area a regular character owing to the general uniformity of building plots. In addition, there are gaps in between terraces and blocks of semi-detached houses that cumulatively create a more open character. The site is in proximity to the junction between Dewsbury Road and Faringdon Avenue. Kingsbridge Close joins Faringdon Avenue near to the appeal site.

5. The proposed dwelling would have a width significantly narrower than the existing dwelling and those houses on neighbouring plots. Owing to the significant contrast, the proposal would appear incongruous and would erode the general uniformity of building proportions that defines the character of the surrounding area.

6. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling would take up a significant proportion of the land to the side of the existing building. The proposal would also be close to the neighbouring house at 195 Faringdon Avenue. In consequence, the proposal constitutes a cramped form of development that would erode the open character that defines end of terraced dwellings within the vicinity.

7. The development would have a significant level of prominence within the surrounding area owing to the road layout. In addition, the proposal would be viewable from a notable proportion of Dewsbury Road and the open space at the end of Kingsbridge Close. The development would therefore appear unduly strident within its immediate environs.

8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a significant adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development would fail, in this regard, to comply with the requirements of the Policies DC3 and DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008) (the Core Strategy) and the Adopted London Borough of Havering Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (the SPD).

9. These policies, and the SPD, seek to ensure that developments, amongst other matters, complement or improve the character of the area; are of a high standard of architectural quality; and are well integrated into the surrounding area.

*Living conditions*

10. The property features a garden that runs at an angle from the rear elevation of the existing property. The boundaries of the garden are marked by substantial fences. Adjacent to the side boundary of the garden is No. 195, which features a single-storey rear extension.

11. As a result of this arrangement, the garden allocated to serve the proposed dwelling would be relatively narrow and short in length, which is uncharacteristic of the immediate surrounding area. This situation would be exacerbated by the boundary treatments and existing neighbouring extension. Cumulatively, these circumstances would result in the garden being significantly enclosed and would prevent users of this space from having sufficient levels of outlook.

12. This is particularly concerning owing to the rear garden being the property's only private outdoor space as the area to the front of the proposed dwelling is shown on the submitted plans as featuring car parking and planting. Therefore, the rear garden is the only private space where residents would be able to partake in outdoor recreation or play.

13. Furthermore, the narrow width of the proposed dwelling has result in rooms that are similarly proportioned. The evidence before me is that the first floor bedroom would lack sufficient room to accommodate the level and type of furniture residents might reasonably expect and for there to be sufficient space

for circulation. As a result, there is insufficient room within the bedroom to meet the likely needs of the future occupiers of the development.

14. In consequence, I conclude that the proposal represents a cramped form of development that would fail to provide suitable living conditions for the future occupiers of the dwelling. The development would fail, in this regard, to comply with the requirements of DC61 of the Core Strategy and the SPD. These policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that developments meet the needs of all people of all ages; and that gardens have enough outlook; and that awkwardly shaped and narrow gardens should be avoided.

**Other Matters**

15. I note that the proposal would increase the local housing supply. However, if I were to apply the tilted balance required by paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework, I would find that the benefits of the development are comparatively small given that the proposal is for a single dwelling only. Given that I have identified significant harm in respect of the impacts upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and the living conditions of the future occupiers of the development, such benefits would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed.

16. I also acknowledge that the development would provide appropriate off-street car parking. However, this is only one matter out of all those which must be considered. Accordingly, the presence of car parking does not overcome the significant harm as previously concluded.

17. References have been made to a previous decision by the Council to grant planning permission for an extension at this property. I do not have all of the information relating to the planning circumstances of this, which lessens the weight that can be attributed to it. Nonetheless, the evidence before me is that the permitted extension has a different design to the development currently under consideration. Furthermore, an extension would not require a separate garden unlike this scheme for a separate dwelling. Therefore, I find that the impacts of an extension are notably different and, as such, this permission does not require me to set aside my previous conclusions.

**Conclusion**

18. For the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Benjamin Clarke*

INSPECTOR