



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3254061
77 Bridge Avenue, Upminster RM14 2LP

- 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 Martin John against the decision of the London Borough of Havering Council.
 - The application Ref P0072.20, dated 21 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as Alterations to the main roof to allow for the erection of a new box dormer to the rear roof-slope to create a habitable space for a loft conversion. Dormer to be clad in metal zinc sheets and to include a glazed balustrade to the large window opening. Works to include the provision of 2No. new roof-lights to the front roof-slope.
-

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 site is an extended semi-detached two storey dwelling located within a residential area of mixed character consisting of semi-detached houses, bungalows and flatted development of various ages and styles.
4. Regardless of the variety of dwelling types and residential alterations present within the street scene and close to the appeal property, and despite both having undergone side extensions, the houses as a pair retain substantial character and symmetry.
5. The original roof design over both pairs of semi-detached houses is hipped. A gable end roof form is proposed above the existing side extension element. The new roof would not only create a different roof type to the dwelling, but also add sizable mass. Overall, it would be out of character with the original roof style, and significantly reduce the symmetry between the two houses.
6. The resultant imbalance to the pair of semi's would not appear as a harmonious or sympathetic form of development. It would be clearly seen from ground level within the street scene and up and down the street. As a consequence, it

- would lead to harm arising to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.
7. A number of the examples brought to my attention by the appellant are semi-detached two storey houses and both have gable end roofs therefore restoring the symmetry. Other semi-detached houses have been altered from the original roof form with no side extension, in contrast to the appeal property. The dwelling of 27 South View Drive has been extended to the side and has a gable end roof type. However, it has not been evidenced by the details presented whether or not the gable end to the original house was erected at the same time as the extension.
 8. Other bungalow examples are not the same house type as the appeal property and do not share precisely the same characteristics. Some of the other applications that have been granted approval are explained by the Council as works that would otherwise be allowed under permitted development. Overall, none of the instances cited by the appellant are the same circumstances as the appeal property.
 9. There may be opportunity to alter the roof under permitted development although any fallback position has not been demonstrated by the appellant in order to allow me consideration of such, or that it could be used as a genuine fallback. Therefore, I apply limited weight to this.
 10. With regards to the rear dormer, this proposal would encompass nearly all of the roof slope adding significant mass to it, appearing as a top-heavy bulky and over-dominant form of development. Furthermore, the proposed fenestration design would not align with the windows below, thus it would further appear out of character with the host dwelling.
 11. Given its prominence, the proposed dormer would be seen from the adjoining dwelling as well as a number of other residential dwellings close to the appeal site. It would not complement the character or appearance of the dwelling and consequentially would harm the character and appearance of the wider area.
 12. There are other rear dormers along this side of Bridge Avenue that have been brought to my attention by the appellant. However, the precise details of these has not been provided, and furthermore, the dormers are contained within the roof slope of the original dwelling, and do not share exactly the same characteristics as the appeal proposal.
 13. To conclude, I have found that harm would arise to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene as a result of the proposed unsympathetic extensions. On this basis, it would be contrary to Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2016 which requires development to have regard to local character, as well as the Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies and Development Plan Document 2008 Policy DC61 in its design aims. It would also not meet the objectives of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.

Other Matters

14. Despite the fact that no objections have been received from neighbouring occupiers, the absence of such is a neutral matter and neither weighs in favour of or against the proposal.

15. Should the appellant consider the Council is inconsistent when making planning decisions for similar proposals, this should be referred to the Council for response, and is not within my domain to comment.

Conclusion

16. I have taken into account the matters before me and come to the conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR