

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2021

by Simon Warder MA BSc(Hons) DipUD(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3262644
100 South View Drive, Upminster RM14 2LL

- 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 Tanith Slay against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0693.20, dated 26 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is the removal of dilapidated existing extensions to the side and rear of the original house and the subsequent erection of a two-storey side extension and a single storey extension to the rear as replacements.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal proposal includes extensions to the side and rear of the property. The Council's concern is limited to the side extension. I see no reason to disagree and have framed the main issue accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the side extension on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached two-storey plus loft with a projecting front gable and two-storey bay window. Its scale, form and appearance are, therefore, typical of the predominantly mid-twentieth century properties in the area. A number of properties in South View Drive have two-storey side extensions whose scale and siting are broadly similar to the appeal proposal. Whilst there is some variation in their form and detailing, they generally complement the existing buildings.
 5. In contrast, the appeal proposal would have a flat roof with a sloping element below the eaves level of the existing building and a parapet with a deep fascia at first floor level. It is not clear from the submitted details how these prominent elements would be detailed or what materials would be used. The walls of the front elevation appear to be finished in vertical boarding and the openings would also have a contemporary appearance. Although the front
-

elevation of the existing building has black timber fascias, the walls are predominantly pebbledash and brick.

6. Whilst neither London Plan (LP) Policies 7.4 or 7.6, the Council's Core Strategy and Development Control Policies 2008 (CS) Policy DC61 or paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) preclude contemporary design, they do require development to be sympathetic to local distinctiveness and complement or improve local character through its appearance and use of materials.
7. In this case, the appearance of the side extension and the materials used would contrast sharply with the more traditional, and locally distinctive, form and materials of the existing building and its neighbours. As a result, notwithstanding that the scale and siting of the extension would be in keeping, its form and, as far as can be ascertained detailing and materials, would jar with its surroundings and create a prominent and discordant element in the street scene.
8. Consequently, I find that the side extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with LP Policies 7.4 and 7.6, CS Policy DC61 and Framework paragraph 127. Nor would it accord with the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document March 2011 insofar as it seeks to ensure that the architectural style, detailing and materials used in residential extensions complements the existing building.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR