



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2020

by Alex Hutson MRTPI CMLI MArborA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3255126

43 Avon Road, Upminster RM14 1QU

- 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 and Mrs Daywood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0318.20, dated 29 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey front extension and canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 43 Avon Road, is a two storey, hip-roofed, semi-detached dwelling, located on the corner of Avon Road and Mersey Avenue. The area is predominantly residential in character. Semi-detached dwellings in the area, whilst of a variety of architectural styles, tend to display a strong symmetrical form and appearance. No 43 has a two storey side extension, close to its side boundary, which is set down from the ridge and set back from the façade and front roofslope of the original part of the dwelling. This affords it a subordinate relationship with the original part of No 43 and maintains a degree of symmetry between the original forms of Nos 43 and the adjoining dwelling, No 41. This contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposal effectively seeks to enlarge the existing side extension by raising the ridge height across most of its width to that of the original part of No 43 and by extending it forward across most of its width to sit flush with the façade and front roofslope of the original part of No 43. An existing front canopy would also be extended across the front of the proposed extension and a porch feature added.
5. I acknowledge that the proposal would use materials to match those of the existing dwelling and that the overall increase in footprint and volume would be modest. I also recognise that views towards the rear of No 43 would not materially alter.

6. Nonetheless, the proposal, primarily by virtue of the front extension element, would fail to display an adequately subordinate relationship with No 43 and would markedly dilute the symmetry between the original part of No 43 and that of No 41. It would thus appear out of keeping with the scale and form of the host dwelling and No 41 and would fail to respect the largely balanced appearance of this pair and other pairs of semi-detached dwellings in the area. Moreover, the proposal, given its proximity to the side boundary of No 43, would appear unduly dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene and would display an awkward and contrived relationship with the small part of the existing side extension which would be retained in its current form. In light of these factors, the proposal would give rise to considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The appellant makes reference to a planning permission¹ at No 9, a semi-detached corner dwelling which has been extended to the side and flush with the front façade of this property. However, it broadly reflects its pair, No 11, which has been extended in a similar manner at some point in the past and thus a degree of symmetry is maintained between this pair of semi-detached dwellings. Furthermore, I observed that the side extension at No 9 is set back a generous degree from its side boundary. The appellant also highlights a full width canopy and porch extension at No 62. Nevertheless, a porch and canopy is only one aspect of the proposal before me. Furthermore, I note that No 62 has a two storey side element set back from the façade of the main part of the house and set in a generous level from its side boundary. Therefore, these examples are not wholly comparable to the proposal before me and in any event, each case should be considered on its own merits.
8. Having regard to the above, I consider that the proposal would be contrary to Policy DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Plan Document 2008 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of London Plan 2016. These policies require, amongst other things, development to maintain, enhance or improve the character and appearance of the area, to be of high quality design and to be appropriate to its context.
9. It would also be contrary to the guidance of the London Borough of Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2011. This advises, amongst other things, that two storey side extensions to semi-detached dwellings should be subordinate to the existing dwelling and should not unbalance the pair of dwellings.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex Hutson

INSPCTEOR

¹ Council Ref: 1773.11