



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 October 2020

by R Sabu BA(Hons), BARCH, MA, PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3244819

4 Church Road, Harold Wood, Romford, RM3 0JX

- 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 Terry Snooks against the decision of London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1578.19, dated 15 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side and first floor rear extension at 4 Church Road, Harold Wood, Romford, RM3 0JX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P1578.19, dated 15 October 2019, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 19/9 4/1/.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the flank elevation.

Procedural Matter

2. While I note the description of development as stated in the appeal form, I have used the description from the application form in the interests of certainty.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
- the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of No 2 Church Road (No 2) with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Church Road is primarily characterised by two storey semidetached dwellings with varied spacings such that the area has a pleasant spacious feel. A number of other properties have been extended such that the forms of the surrounding dwellings are varied.
5. The roof of the proposed side extension would slope from first floor level at the front elevation up to a level that would be significantly lower than the ridge of the roof of the host building. In addition, the width of the side extension would appear to be less than that of the host building. Therefore, while the gap between No 4 Church Road (No 4) and the adjacent property at No 2 would be reduced by the side extension occupying the width of the space to the boundary, given the height and slope of the proposed catslide roof when viewed against the larger three storey massing of No 2, the proposal would not adversely affect the spacious character and appearance of the street scene.
6. The symmetry of No 4 and its adjoining neighbour has been significantly diminished by the hip to gable roof conversion that has been undertaken at the appeal property. Therefore, the proposal would not result in the unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached dwellings.
7. While front dormers are discouraged in Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document Adopted 2011 (SPD) and the width of the proposed front dormer may be greater than that advised, since it would be significantly set back from the front elevation and would appear to be a modest size when viewed against the massing of the adjacent three storey building, in this particular instance it would not be prominent in the street scene.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area. Therefore, it would not conflict with Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008 (CS), and Policy 7.4 of The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy For London Consolidated With Alterations Since 2011 March 2016 (LP), which broadly seek, among other things, development that respect the scale, massing and height of the surrounding physical context and has regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces.
9. It would also not conflict with the aims of the SPD which seeks development that among other things is sympathetic to the existing property and the street scene.

Living conditions

10. Given the two-storey height of the proposed rear elevation and its position relative to No 2, it is likely that some shadow would be cast across part of the rear garden of No 2. However, while I note the tapered boundary and angled building line of No 2, since the rear elevation and the private amenity space would continue to receive daylight from other directions, the living conditions of future occupiers would not be unduly affected in this respect as a result.
11. The proposed side extension would not extend beyond the rear elevation of the first floor which projects a small distance forward of the rear extent of No 2. In terms of height it would be significantly lower than the ridge height of No 2. Therefore, while it would not be set back from the shared boundary as per the guidance in the SPD, it would not result in an undue sense of enclosure or harm to the outlook of neighbouring occupiers.
12. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of No 2 with particular regard to light and outlook. Therefore, it would not conflict with CS Policy DC61 which resists development that would result in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy to existing and new properties. It would also not conflict with the aims of the SPD which seeks development that does not detrimentally affect the living conditions of neighbouring properties.
13. Policy 7.4 of The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy For London Consolidated With Alterations Since 2011 March 2016 relates to local character and is not directly relevant to this main issue.

Other Matters

14. The Council has not objected to the first-floor rear extension or canopy porch. From the evidence before me, given the modest scale and siting away from side elevation of the proposed first floor rear extension, and the modest scale and in keeping design of the canopy porch, I have no reason to disagree.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard conditions relating to commencement of development and specifying plans, a condition regarding external materials is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, a condition removing permitted development rights in relation to windows is necessary to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR