



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/20/3249952

35 Hall Lane, Upminster, RM14 1AF

- 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 Daniel West against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1877.19 dated 16 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of first floor rear extension and alteration of existing front elevation garage roof.
-

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 a detached two storey dwelling with rooms at roof level, a single storey garage to the side and a single storey extension to the rear. It is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of detached two storey properties set back from the road behind parking areas and garden areas, with longer gardens to the rear.
 4. The width of Hall Lane, combined with the setback of houses from the road and the presence of occasional trees and planting associated with gardens provides for a sense of spaciousness and greenery. Further, a number of dwellings along this part of Hall Lane incorporate period features which, together with the even setback from the road, affords the area an attractive sense of uniformity.
 5. During my site visit, I noted that the appeal property retains many of its original period features and makes a positive contribution to its surroundings. The appeal property has been extended to the rear and this has been achieved in a manner that appears complementary and subordinate to the attractive design features, scale and form of the building.
 6. I also observed during my site visit that a number of properties in the wider area have been altered and or extended and that, whilst most changes appear
-

in keeping with their surroundings, occasional changes, including large extensions to the rear of neighbouring dwellings, have failed to complement their host property.

7. The appeal property is located within Zone A of the Hall Lane Policy Area. This Area is recognised by the Council's Core Strategy¹ (Policy DC69) for its special character. Together, the Core Strategy, the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (the Council's Extensions SPD) and the Council's Hall Lane Policy Area Supplementary Planning Document (2009) (the Council's Hall Lane SPD) seek to protect the area's character by, amongst other things, requiring development to maintain or improve local character; and requiring extensions to respect, respond to and appear subordinate to, host properties.
8. The proposed development would result in a large two storey development to the rear of the appeal property. It would be taller and would project further than the existing two storey projection from the rear elevation and notably, it would be significantly wider than this existing projection. Consequently, rather than appear as a subordinate extension, the proposal would comprise a large and imposing addition that would fail to complement and would unduly dominate the rear elevation.
9. Given this, I find that the proposal would draw attention to itself as a feature out of scale with the host property's original features and as a consequence, it would fail to respect those important elements of the appeal property that make a positive contribution to local character.
10. Taking this into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Core Strategy policy DC61; to the Council's Hall Lane SPD; and to the Council's Extensions SPD, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

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).