



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2020

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3255137

180 Lodge Lane, Romford RM5 2ET

- 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 Marin Mazur against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0158.20, dated 5 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2020.
 - The development is for a proposed roof enlargement and loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a semi-detached bungalow in a high-density, urban situation. The surrounding area either side of of this part of Lodge Lane comprises a mixture of building styles and designs, including semi-detached and detached properties.
 4. At the rear, the dormer window would extend across virtually the entire width of the roof. Due to its size and form, the element would be in direct conflict with the specific dormer window advice set out in the London Borough of Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD).
 5. I acknowledge the appellant's arguments that the dormer would not exceed the height of the proposed roof, would not be visible from the public domain and would use matching materials. However, long, unbroken form would dominate the roof of the property. Its height would be flush with the ridgeline of the existing building, and the excessive size would be clearly visible from the private amenity spaces of surrounding dwellings, having a jarring effect by virtue of its scale and extent across the roof.
 6. I observed myriad extensions to other properties in the surrounds, including numerous dormer windows. I recognise that they are a common feature within the streetscene, however none appeared to be of the size proposed under this appeal and each was set within the body of its host roof.
-

7. At the front, the proposed roof enlargement would clearly result in an imbalance between the appeal property and its adjoining neighbour at roof level. However, I note that there is already an imbalance by virtue of the side element to the appeal dwelling. The ridgeline would be continued at the same height and the hipped design at the side would match the existing profile.
8. With these matters in mind, I am of the view that the roof enlargement would be of an acceptable appearance, visually connecting with the existing bungalow without dominating it, and also responding to its design characteristics. It would be appropriately sited and unobtrusive when seen against the form and scale of the existing property.
9. Although the roof enlargement would be acceptable, the rear dormer window would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. There would be conflict with policy DC61 the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008, and policy 7.4 of the London Plan March 2016 that seek to ensure development responds to distinctive local building forms and patterns of development and respects the scale, massing and height of the surrounding physical context.

Conclusion

10. Given the foregoing, I dismiss the appeal.

C Hall

INSPECTOR