

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: 8 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3262331

484 Upper Brentwood Road, Romford RM2 6JA

- 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 and Mrs Miller against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0810.20, dated 12 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Proposed rear dormer to existing loft conversion.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer at 484 Upper Brentwood Road, Romford RM2 6JA in accordance with the terms of the application, ref P0810.20, dated 12 June 2020, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: EX02 and PL01 Rev D.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant describes the appeal proposal as a rear dormer to existing loft conversion. A Certificate of Lawfulness has been granted for conversion of the roof space to habitable accommodation including a hip to gable extension (application reference D0500.19). The hip to gable extension and the rear dormer have been completed. However, the Council considers that the works are not lawful since it believes that the hip to gable extension and the rear dormer were constructed at the same time. The appellant contends that the dormer was only constructed after the hip to gable extension was completed.
3. It is not for me, in the context of this written representation householder appeal, to reach a judgement on the lawfulness or otherwise of the works. Nevertheless, even if the Council's understanding of the sequence of construction is correct, the grant of the Certificate of Lawfulness for the hip to gable extension is a material consideration. I have, therefore, considered the cumulative effect of the hip roof and the rear dormer. The description of development used in paragraph 1 above is taken from the Council's decision notice and includes both elements.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.
-

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling that occupies a prominent position at the junction of Upper Brentwood Road and Cambridge Avenue. As well as the appeal proposals, a part single, part two storey side and rear extension and front porch have been added to the property. The other dwelling in the pair has also been extended to the side. The siting and design of that extension differs from the side extension to the appeal property. As such, much of the symmetry of the pair of dwellings has already been lost.
6. The appellant has also drawn my attention to a number of examples of hip to gable extensions in the area, including that to 2 Cambridge Avenue. That extension and the appeal proposal can be seen together from a range of public viewpoints. Having regard to these considerations therefore, whilst the proposed hip to gable extension further diminishes the symmetry of the pair of dwellings, in this case I consider that its effect would not be unacceptable. This finding, together with the existence of the Certificate of Lawfulness for the hip to gable, outweighs the conflict with paragraph 8.1 of the SPD¹ which presumes against hip to gable extensions where the Council has control over such proposals.
7. The rear dormer is positioned behind the roof of the two-storey side/rear extension. Although it can be glimpsed in public views from sections of Upper Brentwood Road and Cambridge Avenue, it is not prominent in the street scene and adds little to the overall scale and bulk of the building. Both elements of the proposal are more visible from the rear garden of the appeal property. However, views from neighbouring gardens are more oblique and fairly effectively filtered by established planting.
8. Consequently, even taking into account the cumulative effect of the hip to gable extension and the rear dormer, I find that the proposal does not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the existing building or the surrounding area. As such, it does not conflict with Policy DC61 of the Council's Core Strategy and Development Control Policies 2008 or Policy 7.4 of the London Plan. Amongst other things, these policies require proposals to respond to distinctive local building forms and patterns of development and respect the scale and massing of the surrounding physical context. Nor would the proposal conflict with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 127 to the extent that it has similar aims. I have already found that other factors outweigh the conflict with paragraph 8.1 of the SPD.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested a single condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I will impose this condition in the interests of certainty. No other conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be allowed.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR

¹ LB Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD)