



Appeal Decision

Site visit 8 December 2020

by Jan Hebblethwaite MA Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3257787

38 Woodhall Crescent, Hornchurch RM11 3NW

- 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 Jeff Cooper against the decision of the London Borough of Havering Council.
 - The application Ref P0830.20 dated 16 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the impact of the proposed development on the host property and on the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is one of a pair of semi-detached bungalows, at the junction of Woodhall Crescent and Margaret Drive. The immediate area is wholly residential and comprises pairs of bungalows of different designs, interspersed with detached properties which are mainly single storey, and which appear to be of an age. Most have been extended in some way.
4. The proposed development would more than double the width of one of the existing bedrooms, create an en-suite bathroom, and roughly double the size of the existing kitchen and utility room. The plot is narrower at the front and widens along the boundary with Margaret Drive, towards the rear.
5. The roof would retain a hipped form, and the ridge line of the original bungalow would be extended. There is no step down in the roof line and no step back from the frontage. As a result, the extension would appear to dominate the original bungalow and would unbalance the appearance of the pair of bungalows. The attached bungalow at No.36 has an attached garage to the side but the roof is subservient to the main roof and it does not appear to dominate the original bungalow. I do not have any information as to when the garage was constructed so I do not know the policy background in force at that time.

6. The current policy is DC61 contained in the Council's Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008. The policy deals with urban design and requires that development should maintain enhance or improve the character and appearance of the local area and respect the scale massing and height of its surroundings. This policy is reflected in the London Plan (Policy 7.6) and in the Intention to Publish New London Plan (Policy D3).
7. For the reasons set out in paragraph 5, I do not consider that the proposed extension would comply with the policy requirements and that it would cause harm to the appearance of the street scene by failing to respect the prevailing pattern of development and by appearing dominant.

Other matters

8. I have looked at the photographs of other extensions in the immediate locality provided by the Appellant. I also viewed them on my site visit. 40 Woodhall Crescent is on the opposite side of the junction with Margaret Drive and has a garage on the boundary. The roof is lower than that of the original bungalow and it is well set back from the front. The property is detached. For that reason, it is not comparable to the appeal site.
9. 28 Woodhall Crescent is at the junction with Curtis Road. The original bungalow had a different floor plan to the appeal property. The extension is large but has a ridge line which matches the front of the original bungalow, being lower than the ridge behind it. I do not consider that this property is comparable to the appeal site.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jan Hebblethwaite

INSPECTOR