
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: 10 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3250220

42 Ambleside Avenue, Hornchurch RM12 5ES

- 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 & Mrs Gary and Lee Ann Templeman against the decision of London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0004.20 dated 4 January 2020 was refused by notice dated 2 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension.
-

Decision

The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

1. 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms the right-hand half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses. The first floor of the front elevation is staggered and the majority of the semi-detached houses within proximity of the appeal dwelling have this feature. It could be seen that the neighbouring property No.40 has a two-storey front extension that protrudes further than the original front elevation, and No.44 has a two-storey extension that creates a flush front elevation at first floor level. Nonetheless, the first-floor setback feature of the semi-detached houses along Ambleside Road is a distinctive feature of this road and generally provides a characteristic sense of consistency.
4. The development would protrude forward from the main elevation and this additional bulk would eradicate the first floor stepped feature and the distinctiveness it provides. As such the proposed extension would be a considerable deviation from the local character and would diminish the sense of consistency. Whilst the proposal would be very similar to that at No.40, this is the sole example in the area. Two-storey front extensions are not a common feature of the wider locality and so do not strongly inform the character of the

area as a whole. As such, the proposal would appear as a bulky form of development that would fail to respond to the local character.

5. 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. It further conflicts with Policy 7.4 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011, March 2016, which seeks to ensure developments have regard to the structure of an area or street and mass of surrounding buildings.
6. It would also conflict with the Residential Extension and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted 2011, (SPD), which states that large front extensions are generally unacceptable due to the adverse effect on the character of the street.

Other Matters

7. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant's situation regarding the need for an accessible toilet on the ground floor, this does not provide justification for the extension's harmful first-floor aspect.
8. The appellant states the proposal would eradicate the issue of not being able to see their children playing in the street due to the extension at No.40. However, these personal circumstances are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that has been identified.

Recommendation and Conclusion

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

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. 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