

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3257937

94 Hall Lane, Upminster RM14 1AQ

- 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 Jonathan Barton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0632.20, dated 7 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of garage into a living room and erection of a front extension with additional windows on flank walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, pair of dwellings and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a traditional form and a Tudor style design on the front elevation. It is sited within a residential location mostly comprised of other large detached dwellings of various designs that are set back from the road and located within spacious and well landscaped plots. The proposal includes the infill of the space to the front of the dwelling with a single storey pitched roof extension. The Council's concerns relate solely to this part of the proposal.
5. The proposed front extension, although only single storey, would obscure some of the Tudor design. It is noted that it has been designed to match the existing two-storey projection on the front of the property which uses exposed brick on the ground floor with Tudor style framework on the first floor. However, the positioning of the extension and coverage of some of the Tudor style features, particularly that part between the ground and first floor windows, which provide a positive contribution to the character of the dwelling, would appear incongruous and out of the keeping with the host dwelling.

6. This is exacerbated by the proposed roof from of the extension which would protrude forward of the current building line, and the proposed shallow roof pitch which would not match the steep roof pitches seen on the existing dwelling. This would result in an extension which would have a more modern appearance than the host dwelling and would appear at odds with the design and traditional character and appearance of the property. The location of the proposed extension, to the front of the dwelling, would make it highly visible from the public realm. Although there would be limited views of the side elevation of the proposal, from the front its intrusive impact on the host dwelling would have a detrimental impact on the overall streetscene.
7. Although the dwellings at No.94 and No.92 are similar in design and were constructed as a pair, they already have differentiating features and are not connected in any way. Therefore the proposed extension would not significantly alter any joint impact they have on the character and appearance of the area.
8. However, it has been concluded that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy DC61 of the Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008) which states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area.
9. The proposal would also be contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2011) which states that large front extensions are generally unacceptable due to the adverse effect they can have on the appearance of the original house and the character of the street, and the Hall Lane Policy Area SPD (2009) which requires extensions to be complementary to the existing dwelling.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has stated that the proposed development would not impact or overshadow the neighbouring properties, however this would not overcome the harm found.

Conclusions and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR