

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

**by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 17 December 2019**

---

F

**Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/19/3240445**

**4 Romney Chase, Hornchurch, Essex RM11 3BJ**

- 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 Matthew Farrant against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
  - The application Ref P1171.19, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2019.
  - The development proposed is part single and part two storey front extension and porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. Neither the appellant or the Council have been able to provide a copy of the signed declaration from the application form, I have therefore omitted the date received from the banner heading.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached two storey dwelling within a predominantly residential area. It lies in Sector 4 of the Emerson Park Policy Area. The Council's document entitled 'Emerson Park Policy Area Supplementary Planning Document' (EPPASPD) describes the area as having a distinctive character of varied and well-maintained single family detached dwellings in spacious and well landscaped grounds. It advises that massing and architectural character of new extensions should be compatible with the character of the local street scene.
5. The Council's document entitled 'Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document' (SPD) advises that dormers should be well contained within the body of the roof and should relate to the windows of the original house in proportion, design and position. Dormer windows facing the street should not cause harm to the street scene.
6. The appeal site is one of four two-storey detached properties of similar design and siting located within a small cul-de-sac. The appeal site and its three immediate neighbours are characterised by their overall uniformity with long prominent roof slopes, consistency in the position of eaves line and front

dormer windows. However, there is variety in their fenestration detail and the appeal property is notably different in that the existing dormer window has a pitched tiled roof.

7. The proposed front addition would extend the two storey eaves line on the front elevation forward, infilling the existing set back to the front and creating a consistent single storey eaves line. The proposed dormer window, designed with a hipped pitched roof, would be contained within the roof slope and set away from the eaves line and in from the side gable. Despite this, its overall size would dominate the roof slope. It would appear particularly prominent because of the appeal site's proximity to the street frontage and because its size would be significantly larger than the adjacent dormer windows.
8. Consequently, the proposed dormer would not reflect the size and siting of the dormer windows within the four similar properties. It would disrupt the current symmetry along the street frontage which, in part, defines the character and appearance of the area on the entrance to Romney Chase. As such it would appear as a bulky and incongruous addition to the roof that would be out of character with the building and street scene.
9. Overall, I conclude that the dormer window would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area and conflict with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2016 and Policies DC61 and DC69 of the London Borough of Havering Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Planning Document 2008. These policies collectively seek to ensure that development respects its surrounding context including the character of the local street scene. It would also fail to accord with the design principles within the EPPASPD and the SPD.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

*Diane Cragg*

INSPECTOR