



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2020

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 November 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3256838

27 Tennyson Way, Hornchurch RM12 4BU

- 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 Mark Stanley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0667.20 was refused by notice dated 23 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a flat roof front dormer window which would measure approximately 3.15m wide, 2.74m deep and 1.87m high. In addition, a roof light is proposed to the front elevation of the dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey terraced dwelling of traditional design. There are no front dormer windows in this terrace. There are some front dormer windows in some properties in the surrounding area. I note that many predate current Council guidance. I do not consider that they constitute a precedent. I have determined the proposal before me on its individual merits. From my observations, the large dormer windows in the vicinity are not an overriding feature of the character of the area which predominately comprises traditional two-storey dwellings. Many of the large dormer windows do not make a positive contribution to the appearance of the area.
4. Guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2011) stipulates that dormers should be well below the ridge line. If the Council considers that a dormer facing the highway will not cause harm to the original house or street scene, its width should be no greater than 1.2 metres. Where a larger window area is required on an elevation facing the highway, two smaller dormers with pitched roofs should be

- provided. The combined width of a number of dormers on a roof facing the highway should not exceed half the width of the existing roof.
5. The proposal includes a flat roof front dormer window some 3.15 metres wide. The top of the dormer would be positioned almost on the existing ridge line. As such, the proposal would not be in accordance with SPD guidelines.
 6. From my observations, due to the scale, bulk and design of the proposed dormer window and its frontage position, it would appear as an unacceptably dominant addition to the roof, overwhelming the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. In such a prominent position, this would not be in keeping with the appearance of the surrounding area. It would create further visual harm to that created by some examples of other large front dormer windows in the vicinity.
 7. The proposed roof light would be a discrete addition, which would be in keeping with the character of the dwelling. However, it would be part of the loft conversion reliant on the proposed front dormer window. Thus, it is not appropriate to allow the roof light in isolation.
 8. For the reasons stated above and having taken into consideration all matters raised, including the need for more living accommodation, I conclude that the proposed front dormer window would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the appearance of the surrounding area. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to SPD guidance and contrary to Policy DC61 in the Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008) and Policy 7.4 in the London Plan (2016), where they seek to maintain, enhance or improve the character and appearance of the local area. I consider these Policies to be broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, where the Framework seeks to ensure good design.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR