
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3257875

9 Abbey Wood Lane, Rainham RM13 9QH

- 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 Tracy Price against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0663.20, dated 18 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 7 Abbey Wood Lane in relation to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached chalet bungalow located on the junction of Abbey Wood Road and Briscoe Road in a suburban residential area. The surrounding properties are of a variety of sizes and design, however the area immediately surrounding the appeal site is characterised by properties that are generally detached or semi-detached and set back from the road, located on relatively spacious plots. The proposal would replace an existing car port on the side of the dwelling with a two-storey side extension and also includes a two-storey rear extension with a flat roof.
 5. Although set back from the road, due to its location, the proposed side extension would still be highly visible within the streetscene. The proposal
-

would match the form of the existing dwelling at the same height and with no set back from the front elevation, resulting in an extension which would not be subordinate to the original dwelling. The two-storey nature of the proposed extension and the proximity to the plot boundary would reduce the visual gap between the appeal site and the neighbouring properties and would appear cramped within its surroundings, to the detriment of the streetscene and the spacious nature of the existing property.

6. The two-storey rear extension would adjoin the side extension and would have limited visibility from the streetscene. However, due to its two-storey, flat roof nature, it would be a large and bulky addition to the rear of the property regardless of the size of the garden. Its significant mass, along with a height slightly above the eaves of the existing dwelling, would result in an overly dominant addition to the host dwelling which would appear incongruous within the surrounding area.
7. In conclusion, for the reasons above, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would be contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008). This policy states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area. It would also be contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2011) which states that detached houses should not be extended up to side boundaries since this would involve closing the characteristic spacing between dwellings and leave no access to the rear.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed extension would be built up to the boundary which abuts a driveway shared by No.7 and No.7a Abbey Wood Lane. It is noted that the Council's decision notice and report make reference to No.7 however, as their description of the neighbouring dwelling relates to the property at No.7a, it appears likely that this was in error. Nevertheless, I will consider both neighbouring properties in this appeal.
9. Due to the relationship of the two properties, the proposed development would be located a sufficient distance from the front elevation of No.7, which is angled slightly away from the appeal property. Therefore, even though the appeal property would be 3 metres closer to this neighbouring dwelling, the proposal would not have a significant impact on the outlook from the windows on the front elevation of No.7 which would only partially face the proposed extension.
10. The dwelling at No.7a is set back from the appeal property and the proposed extension would be positioned forward of this dwelling. Although it would be 3 metres closer to the shared boundary, the height of the proposal would match the existing dwelling. Due to this, and the forward position of the appeal property, the impact on the outlook from the window on the front elevation of No.7a would be minimal.
11. Consequently, for the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings and would not conflict with Policy DC61 which states that planning permission will not be granted where the proposal results in

unacceptable overshadowing or loss of daylight to existing properties. There would also be no conflict with the SPD which states that proposals with an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours will not be granted planning permission.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has raised concerns with the conduct of the Council stating that they were not given the opportunity to amend the proposed design and received no guidance from the Council. However, this does not affect my consideration of the planning merits of the appeal.

Conclusions and Recommendation

13. Although it has been found that the proposed development would not affect the living conditions of occupiers of the neighbouring properties, it would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR