



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2020

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3252102
25 Kenway, Rainham, RM13 9PY

- 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 Ms Taylor Lacy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0202.20 dated 5 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of garage and conservatory and construction of single storey rear extension and double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of a pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings, the other being No 27 Kenway. It has a small single storey garage to the side which is attached to a similar garage adjoining the neighbouring dwelling, No 23 Kenway.
 4. Kenway is a residential cul-de-sac, comprising two-storey semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind parking areas and/or gardens. Houses are set back from the street in a uniform manner, other than at the very end of the cul-de-sac, where the final pair of dwellings on either side of the road step back further from the road.
 5. The set-back combines with the presence of gaps between pairs of properties – either at ground or first storey level – and similarities in design and materials, to provide for uniformity and a sense of spaciousness. Further, the presence of street trees, garden planting and glimpses between gaps to gardens behind adds a sense of greenery and contributes to the area's spacious qualities.
 6. The proposed development would extend the appeal property at two storey height to the side boundary with No 23. Whilst the extension would be set back slightly from the front elevation, its height and width would result in it
-

significantly reducing the gap between the appeal property and No 23. The proposal would lead the appeal property to fill the width of its plot at two storey height.

7. As noted above, the gaps between pairs of dwellings contribute to the positive qualities of Kenway. The proposed development would severely reduce one of these gaps, leaving only the area above No 23's garage between the built form of the two dwellings. I find that this would result in an incongruous terracing effect, to the harm of the area's attributes.
8. The proposed development would introduce a form of development uncharacteristic of Kenway. Whilst the appellant, in support of her case, has provided examples of other two storey extensions, the specific circumstances relating to each of these are all different to those relating to the proposed development. Notwithstanding this, I have found that the proposal would result in harm to local character, leading to the conclusion below.
9. Taking the above into account, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework); London Plan (2016) Policy 7.4; Core Strategy¹ Policy DC61; and the Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other considerations

10. In support of her case, the appellant states that the proposal is in line with the government drive to generate economic activity. However, I have found that the proposal would result in harm to local character and in this case, the generation of economic activity does not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008).