
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by Jan Hebblethwaite MA Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3258198

17 Essex Close, Romford, Essex RM7 8BD

- 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 Sharandeep Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0496.20 dated 9 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is double storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Procedural matter

1. Of the plans submitted, drawing 17-PP-201 Rev C dated Sep 2019 purports to show the existing floor plans of the host property comprising a ground and first floor. By comparison, drawing 17-PP-202 Rev C purports to show the existing rear elevations which include a rear dormer extension forming a second floor in the roof slope. The side elevations are shown on drawing 17-PP-203 rev C and include the rear dormer. However, the host property as viewed on my site visit does not resemble the rear or side elevations shown on those plans. I saw that the extension forming the second floor was not contained within the roof. The hipped roof has been replaced with a gable wall with a ridged roof.
2. It appears from the plans showing the proposed development (17-PP-204C and 17-PP-205C) that the host property as extended would retain the roof extension already constructed. However, drawing 17-PP-206C which purports to show the proposed side elevations does not reflect the roof slope of the host property as I viewed it.
3. This decision is based on the proposed side and rear extensions being constructed at the host property as it appeared to me on 8 December 2020.

Decision

4. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the host property and of the street scene.

Reasons

6. The immediate vicinity of the appeal site is wholly residential comprising mostly pairs of semi-detached dwellings, probably constructed post-war. The host property is one of such a pair of semi-detached houses. Essex Close is formed of an inverted "T" and the host property sits to one side of the junction of the "T". For that reason, the existing roof extension is very prominent in the street scene when viewed from the side. The proposed development would be equally prominent.
7. Although the proposed roof of the side extension would be hipped, it steps down and achieves an awkward relationship with the existing gable wall, which itself replaced the original hipped roof. The proposed hipped roof and gable wall fail to reflect the shape of the roof of the attached dwelling and together with the bulk of the proposed extension, would create an unbalanced appearance when viewing the pair of attached houses from the front.
8. When viewed from the side, the creation of a hipped roof over the ground and first floor extension introduces another roof line, which gives a jumbled and incoherent appearance. Whilst several other properties in Essex Close and the wider area have been extended in various ways, none appear to have the impact and prominence of that proposed at the host property.
9. Policy DC61 of the Council's Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document deals with urban design and states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances, or improves the character and appearance of the local area, and in particular requires development to respect the scale massing and height of the surrounding physical context. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document ("SPD") provides guidance on the implementation of the Council's policies and policy DC 61 in particular (paragraph 1.14).
10. Paragraph 4.4 of the SPD confirms that extensions should be subordinate to the host property and that an out of scale extension would appear obtrusive. Paragraph 4.17 explains that a defining characteristic of semi-detached housing is the uniformity and symmetry of the attached dwelling. Paragraph 4.20 confirms that the roof of an extension should match the roof of the original property.
11. In view of the roof extension already carried out and the prominence of the host property at the junction of Essex Close, I conclude that the proposed development fails to comply with Policy DC61 and the guidance in the SPD.

Other matters

12. I have read the Appellants personal statement, at Appendix A of his statement. I understand that a series of refusals of proposals to extend the host property is costly and disappointing. However, in this appeal, the impact of the proposals on the host property and the street scene is such that there is material conflict with policies and guidance.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

Jan Hebblethwaite

INSPECTOR