

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3250592

88 Hillview Avenue, Hornchurch RM11 2DJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Marc Shaw against the decision of London Borough of Havering Council.
 - The application Ref P1833.19 dated 6 December 2019 was refused by notice dated 2 March 2020.
 - The proposed development is described in the application form as first floor dormer window extension of 2m in depth.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The decision notice refers to a Havering Residential Design Guide 2011. However, the officer's report and the appellant's statement of case both refer to the Residential Extension and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), and this SPD is what the Council have provided me with. As such I have considered the proposal against this SPD.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms the right-hand half of a pair of modest single storey semi-detached houses. It includes a single storey rear extension, a front dormer and a rear dormer. Due to the gap between the appeal dwelling and No.86, the rear dormer and extension are clearly visible from the street when approaching from the east. Various loft conversions including dormer windows of different styles, could be seen within the surrounding area, all of which appeared traditional in design by virtue of the setback from the eaves and siting within the main roof area. Traditional dormer windows are therefore a common feature of the surrounding area.

6. The proposal would extend the current rear dormer beyond the eaves of the main roof onto the single storey rear extension. This would be a considerable deviation from the traditional pattern of dormers found within the surrounding area and so would appear discordant. The siting and additional bulk of the proposal, even if it is below the ridge line and less than the width of the host dwelling, would detract from the general modest nature of the host dwelling. It would also be clearly visible from the street and the proposal would appear as a disproportionate, bulky and incongruous form of development that fails to respond to the local character.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document, Adopted 2008, (Core Strategy), which seeks to ensure developments respond to local forms of development and respect the scale of the surrounding physical context.
8. The proposal adheres to some parts of the Residential Extension and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted 2011, (SPD), which states, dormers should never extend above the ridge line. However, other aspects of the SPD, where it states dormers should be contained well within the body of the roof, are not complied with. Although "well" is not defined, it is evident the proposal would not be contained within the body of the roof as it extends beyond the eaves. As such, despite compliance with some aspects of the SPD, the development would still be unacceptably harmful.

Other Matters

9. Whilst the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and would improve the quality of the internal space, these factors do not outweigh the harm the proposal presents.

Recommendation and Conclusion

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

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR