

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2020

by C Jack BSc MA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3252570

67 Cranham Road, Hornchurch, Essex RM11 2AZ

- 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 T Ison against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0103.20, dated 21 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a raised ridge and roof configuration to create habitable accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a raised ridge and roof configuration to create habitable accommodation at 67 Cranham Road, Hornchurch, Essex RM11 2AZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0103.20, dated 21 March 2020, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, having particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. Cranham Road is a principally residential street comprised of a variety of mainly detached and semi-detached homes. 67 Cranham Road (No 67) is a detached bungalow of traditional design, which has a very modest appearance from the street in terms of its scale relative to the two-storey houses either side (65 and 69 Cranham Road). It is set back from the road compared to No 69 but, partly due to a single storey extension, it projects further to the rear than both No 65 and No 69. All three properties have good-sized rear gardens, which slope downwards away from the rear elevations.

4. The proposed roof alterations would increase the mass and proximity of the roof configuration to the neighbouring properties, including through the introduction of side gable ends to the main roof, and the introduction of a flat-roofed rear dormer. While this change would be close to the side boundaries and clearly visible to adjacent occupiers, particularly from their gardens, the overall effect on outlook from the rear of Nos 65 and 69 would be limited due to the relatively modest scale of the proposals and the more dominant, two-storey, nature of the neighbouring houses. The increased ridge height would be less than 1m, which in this context would not be prominent in the skyline or significantly overbearing in relation to occupiers of Nos 65 and 69.
5. Furthermore, the principal rear outlook from Nos 65 and 69 is over the reasonably lengthy rear gardens, with good separation from any dwellings behind. As such, the area at the rear of the properties has a generous and open feel, which would not be significantly intruded, enclosed, or eroded by the proposal.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, having particular regard to outlook. It would therefore accord with the relevant requirements of Policy DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008 and Policy 7.4 of The London Plan 2016, which together and among other things seek to ensure that development has regard to its context, including in terms of its effect on surrounding buildings.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard time limit, a plans condition is necessary in the interests of certainty and a materials condition is necessary in the interests of the satisfactory appearance of the development. The Council also suggested conditions requiring obscure glazing of the front dormer, and the removal of permitted development rights in respect of windows or openings in the side walls. Neither is necessary given the relationship and reasonable separation between No 67 and the properties adjacent and opposite.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed.

Catherine Jack

INSPECTOR