
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/19/3240197

The Willows, 10 Lower Bedfords Road, Romford RM1 4LY

- 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 William Green against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1792.18, dated 1 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with patio/steps.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description above differs from that on the planning application form, including reference to the proposed patio and steps. This description has been adopted on the appeal form and appears on the Council decision notice and I have determined the appeal on the basis of this description.
3. The evidence does not indicate that there is any disagreement in relation to the patio and steps.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the rear extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of 8 Lower Bedfords Road, with particular regard to whether it would be an overbearing form of development.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, which is detached, already benefits from an existing single storey rear outrigger although this only projects from the eastern side of the rear elevation. The proposal seeks an extension which would provide a rear outrigger across the whole of the rear elevation.
6. With interests in protecting the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, guidance within the Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Guidance (2011) (SPD) states that as a general rule, detached houses can be extended by up to 4 metres in depth from the rear wall of the original dwelling. In this instance, the projection would be in excess of 6 metres.

7. Significantly, 8 Lower Bedfords Road, to the west of the appeal property is set further forward, meaning that the extension would project a notable distance beyond the rear elevation of this neighbouring property. Although both dwellings are set off from the shared boundary, the gap between them and the boundary is very limited, allowing for little more than a narrow walkway on either side. As a result, the extension would be set only a short distance away from one of the ground floor windows within the rear elevation of No.8.
8. As a result of this staggered building line, the depth of the extension would appear significant when viewed from No.8 as it would be added on to the main body of the dwelling which is already set much further back than No. 8. While the extension would be of single storey design, its height would be well in excess of the boundary fence and it would sit prominently above the existing boundary treatment. The height of the extension would be accentuated towards its southern end due to the falling land levels.
9. Subsequently, without any substantive evidence to demonstrate otherwise, I consider that the depth, height and position of the proposed extension would result in it being an overbearing form of development when viewed from the rear elevation of No.8 which would also result in loss of light to this property. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of this dwelling which would have an adverse impact on the enjoyment of their home.
10. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DC61 of the Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD (2008) which amongst other things seeks to protect the living conditions of the occupiers of existing properties. The extension would also be contrary to SPD guidance and whilst I note that the advice relating to the depth of extensions is a general rule, potentially allowing for extensions which project from the rear wall of the original dwelling by more than 4 metres, there is no evidence before me to suggest that an extension of the depth proposed would be justified in this instance.
11. I acknowledge that the proposal would not lead to harm to the privacy of neighbouring occupiers as a result of its largely blank side elevations. This is however a neutral factor.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR