



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/19/3238382 19 Martin Drive, Rainham RM13 9NB

- 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 Richard Harrison against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0759.19, dated 9 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as first floor side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side and rear extension at 19 Martin Drive, Rainham RM13 9NB within the terms of the application Ref, P0759.19, dated 9 May 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drwg No MTN/01 April 2019, MTN/02A April 2019.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling located at the end of a cul-de-sac of other pairs of predominately uniform semi-detached and terraced houses. The dwellings at the end of the cul-de-sac are slightly angled to one another to follow the curve of the road. The appeal property appears to have converted the former attached garage into a habitable room and it is above this element that a first floor extension is proposed, including a rear extension.

4. There is a narrow but discernible gap between the appeal site and No. 18 and this would be retained as a result of the proposal. No. 18 has not been extended at first floor above the side garage, and the two properties would not merge into one another as a result of this proposal.
5. From the front elevation, the proposed chamfer at first floor would reduce the proposed extension's overall width, and together with the proposed set back at first floor and the set down of the ridge line to the host ridge, would reduce its visual impact. These design characteristics are also evident to other side extensions within close proximity to the appeal site.
6. Furthermore, the use of matching materials, fenestration details with consistent eaves lines, as a result, the development would harmonise with the host dwelling. The proposal would appear subordinate to the host dwelling and cause no harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.
7. Whilst there would be an element of unbalance that would occur to the pair of semi-detached dwellings as a result of the development, given the proposed design solution, this is not harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. The design features that are proposed to be incorporated into the extension would broadly align with the design advice contained within the Council's Adopted Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2011.
8. The proposal would therefore be appropriate development within its context and would accord with the aims of Policy DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008 to, amongst other considerations, complement the character of the area.

Conditions

9. With regards to the Government's Planning Practice Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework, in addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition relating to the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. Furthermore, a condition in relation to materials is reasonable in order to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR