
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: 14 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3257734

31 Forth Road, Upminster, Essex RM14 1PX

- 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 Mrs Kim McWilliam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0799.20, dated 3 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and front entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and front entrance porch at 31 Forth Road, Upminster, Essex RM14 1PX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0799.20, dated 3 June 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: CC/19/19, CC/19/19/A Plan 1 of 2 and CC/19/19/A Plan 2 of 2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows, other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be constructed on the side elevation of the building.

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 area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a conservatory and small extension to the rear, alongside a detached garage. The attached neighbouring dwelling, No.29, is similar in size to the appeal property however the two dwellings are not symmetrical or similar in form. The surrounding area is residential in nature with mostly other pairs of semi-detached properties and terraced dwellings within the vicinity of the appeal site. A number of these have rear or side extensions.
5. The Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2011 states that for semi-detached properties two-storey side extensions should be set back 1 metre from the front wall of the dwelling to create a break in the roofline and façade, and avoid a terracing effect. The proposed two-storey side extension would be set back 0.5 metres from the front elevation. However, there is not a consistent façade between the two semi-detached houses currently and there is a significant gap to the next house on the other side. As such the extension would avoid a terracing effect and the set back from the front elevation and significantly lower ridge height, along with the modest width, would ensure the side extension is suitably subordinate to the main dwelling.
6. Due to the location of the appeal site, at the end of Forth Road, the proposed side extension and twin-hipped roof design would be highly visible within the streetscene. It is noted that there are a number of similarly sized and designed two-storey side extensions within the vicinity of the appeal site. This includes at 2 Colne Valley, which is also located in a prominent position at the end of the road but is not a visually intrusive feature within the streetscene. The presence of these comparable developments demonstrates that the proposed side extension would not be at odds with the character of surrounding area and would not be an incongruous addition to the streetscene.
7. The side extension would leave a 0.8 metre gap between the dwelling and the boundary fence providing access to the rear garden. As this boundary fence borders the rear gardens of the properties on Severn Drive, the extension would not be located in close proximity to another two-storey building, hence maintaining the existing spacious gap between the appeal site and neighbouring properties. Therefore, although the remaining space to the side of the dwelling may be smaller than at present, the proposal would not appear cramped within its surroundings.
8. It has been noted by the Council that the proposed rear extension would be 0.5 metres greater in depth than the maximum stated within the SPD. However, it was concluded that this would not be out of character with the surrounding garden environment. I agree with these findings and consider that the depth of the proposed rear extension would not appear overly large due to the proposed mono-pitched roof and modest eaves height. It also would only project around 3.3m rearwards of the rear elevation of No 29. The garden space is also suitably sized to accommodate such a rear extension. Similarly, the Council did not object to the proposed porch and I find no reason to disagree with this.

9. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would accord with Policy DC61 of the Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008). This policy ensures that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty and precision. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.
11. A condition has also been included, as requested by the Council, to ensure that no further windows are formed in the flank elevation of the dwelling without prior permission. This is deemed necessary to ensure there is no loss of privacy for the occupiers of the neighbouring properties on Severn Drive.

Conclusions and Recommendation

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

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR