
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2021

by R Bartlett PGDIP URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/21/3270859

16 Alverstoke Road, Romford, RM3 8QR

- 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 John Marsh against the decision of the London Borough of Havering Council.
 - The application Ref P0091.21, dated 18 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground and first floor rear extension at 16 Alverstoke Road, Romford, RM3 8QR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0091.21, dated 18 January 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Project number 1120/04/LP and Project number 1120/04/SK01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall be those detailed in the approved drawings listed above.
 - 4) No first floor windows shall be inserted in the side elevations of the extension hereby permitted.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to views from rear gardens; and
 - the living conditions of neighbours, with particular regard to increased sense of enclosure, loss of outlook and loss of sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The site comprises a two-storey house located within a terraced row of 6. There are almost identical terraced rows of houses arranged in blocks to the south and east of the site and also within the surrounding area.
4. It is proposed to extend the dwelling to the rear in order to create a dining room and WC on the ground floor and a large family bathroom above. The extension would project 3m from the existing rear wall of the dwelling and would have a hipped roof, the ridge height of which would be well below that of the host dwelling. The roof would be tiled to match the existing roof. The walls at ground floor level would be finished in bricks to match the existing walls and the upper part of the extension would have a rendered finish.
5. During my site visit I observed a number of similar two-storey rear extensions, 3 of which I could clearly see whilst standing within the rear garden of the appeal site and another that I saw whilst walking around the immediate surrounding area.
6. The extension would be marginally closer to the boundaries of the neighbouring properties on either side of the appeal site than recommended by the council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), but would otherwise accord with this guidance. As a result of the small scale of the extension, which would be set in from the boundaries at first floor level and set down from the ridgeline, it would in my view be subservient to the host dwelling and would not appear incongruous or visually intrusive when viewed from surrounding rear gardens.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be in accordance with policies D1 and D4 of The London Plan and policy DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Adopted 2008 (CS & DCP), which collectively seek to ensure new development is of good design, which maintains the character and appearance of the local area.

Living conditions

8. As noted above, the extension would be marginally closer to the boundaries of the neighbouring properties on either side of the appeal site than recommended by the council's SPD. However, the submitted plans clearly demonstrate that the 45 degree zone, measured from the centre of the nearest neighbouring windows, would not be breached. At the time of my visit, approximately 13.30, the rear of the dwelling and that of the neighbours was already partially in the shade, which would increase as the sun travels west.
9. Number 14 to the north appears to mirror the appeal property and therefore its nearest windows to the proposal are to non-habitable areas, the landing and stairs and the kitchen door.
10. No first floor windows are proposed in either side of the first floor element of the extensions and any views towards neighbouring properties from the ground floor windows would be blocked by existing 1.8m high gates and fencing. Conditions can be used to ensure no additional windows to those shown on the submitted drawings are added at a later date.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in any adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbours and in that respect would not conflict with policy DC61 of the CS & DCP, which states that permission will not be

granted for proposals that would result in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of sunlight/daylight, overlooking or loss of privacy.

Conditions

12. The council suggested a number of conditions which I have considered against the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance. For clarity, I have imposed conditions setting out the time limit within which development must commence, the approved drawing numbers and the approved materials. In the interests of protecting the privacy of the occupants of neighbouring properties, I have imposed a condition preventing the installation of first floor windows in the side elevations of the extension. I do not consider it necessary to obscure glaze the ground floor side windows of the extension, which would not overlook neighbours due to the existence of a 1.8m high gate and fence.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR