
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2019

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/19/3232160

7 Burland Road, Romford RM5 3RD

- 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 & Mrs Norman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref PO662.19, dated 29 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing lean-to conservatory and loft conversion involving a new roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. 7 Burland Road is a detached bungalow located within a residential street comprising a mix of dwelling types. A number of properties along the street have had loft conversions utilising dormer windows to create additional roof space. There is some variety in the size and form of properties within the street scene, including in extensions which have been carried out to their roofs. However, the majority of the dwellings, including most of those on the same side of the road as the appeal site, have hipped roofs which slope away from their side and front boundaries.
4. The appeal proposal includes the replacement of the existing hipped roof with a taller pitched roof with side-facing gables and the raising of the roof on the rear projection to provide first floor accommodation over the entire footprint of the existing bungalow (with the exception of the existing conservatory which is to be demolished). That large footprint, together with its height and its side gable features, would result in a roof with a significant bulk and massing compared to the hipped roofs which characterise many of the surrounding properties.
5. Furthermore, the extended roof to the property's rear projection would be taller still than that which is proposed to the front part of the building. It would be highly visible above and behind it in views along Burland Road. As a result of that additional height, the rear projection would no longer maintain the appearance of visual subservience to the front part of the building. Rather, it

- would appear as an unduly dominant feature which would dwarf the front part of the building, to the detriment of its overall character, and that of the wider street scene.
6. Furthermore, the proposed roof of that rear part of the building, projecting above the front roofline, in addition to the side gables to the front part of the building, overall would introduce an incongruous roof form which is not characteristic of the predominantly hipped roofs in the surrounding area.
 7. I have taken into account the scale of the neighbouring extension at 9 Burland Road. However, to some degree, the apparently taller height of that neighbouring property arises from its being located at a higher level than the appeal property due to the slope of the street. Furthermore, the height of that neighbouring property's rear extension has been limited to below the eaves of the host dwelling and therefore it does not have the same level of impact on the character and appearance of the area. Its dormer windows also break up its overall roof form and provide the additional floor space, rather than in the appeal proposal where the entire roof is increased.
 8. It has also been put to me that the design of the roof extension is the smallest possible having regard to footprint and headroom requirements for loft conversion. Be that as it may, and whilst I note that the existing bay window and porch would be retained, and that the existing conservatory would be removed, those matters do not justify or outweigh the harm I have identified above.
 9. Drawing those threads together, for the reasons given and even having regard to the presence of other roof extensions in the vicinity, overall the proposed development would represent an unduly dominant and highly discordant addition to the host property, and would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings.
 10. The development would therefore conflict with Policy DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 which, amongst other things, require development to maintain, enhance or improve the character and appearance of the area and be of a proportion, composition, scale and orientation that enhances, activates and appropriately defines the public realm.
 11. The proposal would also conflict with the aims of the London Borough of Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, which provides general design principles and, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that alterations do not dominate the character of the original house.

Other matters

12. Although the scheme would be unlikely to have adverse implications for the living conditions of neighbouring residents with regard to outlook or light, this does not overcome my concerns with regard to the harm arising to the character and appearance of the area.
13. It has been put to me that the proposed development would improve the living accommodation and allow the family to remain at the property, however this is

a private benefit which would not outweigh the harm which I have identified above to the character and appearance of the area.

14. Reference has been made to the demolition of nearby properties, and their replacement with larger properties. However, such schemes would not be directly comparable to that which is before me, which relates to extensions to the roof of an existing dwelling, and which I have considered on its own planning merits.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR