
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2020

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22/01/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3261403
87 Wingletye Lane, Hornchurch, RM11 3AT

- 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 H P Singh Sumbal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0741.20, dated 2 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as *'to build on the infill at rear of extension and flush the front of the side extension with the property'*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. At the time of my visit a side and rear extension was underway to this two-storey, detached dwelling, and was at an advanced stage of construction. The appeal proposal is to enlarge the side extension to bring it flush with the front elevation of the original dwelling, and to extend it rearwards to align with the depth of the rear extension. The main issue is the effect of the rearward projection of the side extension upon the living conditions at 85 Wingletye Lane, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

3. The existing single-storey side extension has filled a gap between the two-storey flank wall of the appeal property and the boundary with No 85. It extends up to the boundary and projects beyond the original rear elevation of the appeal property by around 3m. The single-storey rear extension that was under construction at the time of my visit extends across the full width of the original dwelling and projects beyond its rear wall by about 8m. The proposal includes squaring the footprint off the building to the rear by extending the side addition by 5m to align with the depth of the rear extension.
4. The neighbouring property at No 85 is set further forward towards Wingletye Lane when compared with the appeal property, and away from the common side boundary by approximately 1m. There is no common rear building line

between these two neighbouring properties. I saw that No 85 has a single-storey rear extension but it only spans part of the rear elevation and is set away from the side nearest to the appeal site. The existing side extension to No 87 already projects well above the typical, approximately 2m high, close-boarded fence which runs along the boundary, and beyond the nearest rear elevation of No 85 by some margin.

5. The additional 5m depth that is proposed would impose itself further on the already fairly enclosed outlook from the nearest rear ground floor window of No 85. The combined form of the extensions would run along the boundary for a considerable length where it would be seen as a dominant and overbearing form of enclosure when viewed from the immediately adjoining garden. Despite its single-storey form, by reason of its proximity, height and depth, the side extension to No 87 would appear overbearing and intrusive when viewed from the neighbouring property and as such would have an unreasonable adverse impact upon the amenity enjoyed by the neighbours. In this regard it would fail to comply with the advice given by the Council within their *Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD March 2011* and would conflict with Policy 61 – *Urban Design* of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008 where it seeks to protect the amenity of existing properties.
6. I accept that the extension would not impact directly upon sunlight reaching No 85, due to the orientation of the properties. However, due to its proximity to the boundary with the neighbouring property, and its overall height and depth, I conclude that the extension would be harmful to the living conditions at 85 Wingletye Lane. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR