



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/20/3257111

46 Farm Road, Rainham RM13 9LG

- 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 P Wells against the decision the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0459-20 dated 31 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension including three front dormers and two front rooflights with rear dormer
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The host property a detached bungalow and is within a wholly residential area, comprising a mix of single storey and two-storey dwellings. When viewed from the road, the host property and its immediate neighbours on the north side of Farm Road retain their original roof shape, albeit some have dormer windows and/or rooflights.
4. The proposed development would change the hipped roof to one with gable ends and would create a second floor above the width of the existing bungalow and over the adjoining garage.
5. 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 requires development to respect the scale, massing and height of the surrounding physical context. The Councils Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document ("SPD") provides guidance on the implementation of the Councils policies and policy DC 61 in particular (paragraph 1.14).

6. 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.
7. The scale and bulk of the proposed development is such that it unbalances the host property. The proposed roof is out of scale with the existing bungalow and is not subordinate to it. The proposed gable end roof would appear to close the gaps between the host property and its immediate neighbours and as a result, would have a detrimental impact on the street scene and the host property.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would fail to comply with Policy DC61 and the guidance in the SPD by reason of the detrimental impact created by its bulk.

Other Matters

9. During my site visit, I viewed the properties referred to by the Appellant in his statement. Generally, they comprise properties which are likely to have been single storey when originally constructed. However, I do not know when they were converted and therefore, I do not have information as to the policies in force at the time. In addition, I cannot know whether they had the same distinctive hipped roof design before conversion, as does the host property. For those reasons I do not consider those properties to be comparable to the appeal development and I have given them little weight in reaching my conclusion.
10. The Appellant refers to the development which would be permitted without the need for express planning permission, under the General Permitted Development Order. Such development would not be of the same size and bulk as the proposed development and would therefore not have the same detrimental impact on the host property and the street scene.

Conclusion

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

Jan Hebblethwaite

INSPECTOR