



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2021

by Michael J Muston BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 February 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3261292

48 Dunster Close, Romford RM5 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 Hira Singh Bhakar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0720.20, dated 29 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a part two storey, part single storey side extension, single storey front extension and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The area around the appeal site is characterised by two storey dwellings dating from the mid 20th century. Most are semi-detached, with hipped roofs, which is a significant element of the character of the area, as is the existence of gaps between the pairs of semi-detached houses, particularly above ground floor level.
4. Because of the location of the appeal site at the far end of one part of Dunster Close and the fact that No 48 is set much closer to the road than its neighbour to the south, the appeal property is very prominent within the street scene, when viewed from both Dunster Close and Dover Close.
5. The appeal property has recently been extended by a hip to gable loft conversion with a large rear dormer, following the grant of a certificate of lawfulness (Ref D0157.17). The resulting south-facing side elevation is clearly visible when approaching the site along Dover Close and then Dunster Close. It appears as very much out of keeping with the roof form of other nearby houses. The extended appeal property is also very noticeable when approaching from the east along Dunster Close. From this direction, the change from hip to gable makes No 48 appear out of keeping with its neighbour at No 46. However, the side elevation is not visible from this

direction and the retention of the gap between Nos 48 and 50 reduces the harm.

6. The appeal proposal would result in the property regaining a hipped roof on its prominent side elevation. This would have the potential to improve the appearance of No 48 when viewed on approach from the south. However, because the recently erected gable extension and rear dormer are proposed to be retained in their current form, the hipped roof would terminate below the ridge, and result in a roof form that would appear awkward and incongruous. As a result, the appeal property would still appear as out of keeping with its neighbours when viewed from Dunster and Dover Close to the south.
7. In addition, when seen from Dunster Close to the east, the characteristic gap at first floor level and above between the pairs of semi-detached houses (in this case between Nos 48 and 50) would appear as being significantly eroded. The awkward roof form described above would also be apparent from this direction, and the increased width of the property above ground floor level would unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses comprising Nos 46 and 48.
8. Overall, the proposal would result in this very prominent property appearing out of keeping with other neighbouring houses, when viewed from both the east and south. It would cause significant harm to the street scene and the character and appearance of the area.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (2016), and Policy DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008). These policies seek development that has regard to the form function and structure of an area, that makes a positive contribution to a coherent public realm and streetscape, and which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Michael J Muston

INSPECTOR