



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 18 November 2021 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEMA, CEnv

Decision by H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/21/3280174

41 Homeway, Harold Wood, Romford, Essex RM3 0HD

- 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 Jaimin Patel (Shiraz Architects) against the decision of London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0618.21, dated 31 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension comprising loft conversion with rear dormer and change of roof form from hipped to half hip/gable end roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a roof extension comprising loft conversion with rear dormer and change of roof form from hipped to half hip/gable end roof at 41 Homeway, Harold Wood, Romford, Essex, RM3 0HD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0618.21, dated 31 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Drawing No. 2521-02 and Drg No 2521-03.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.
3. During the planning application process the description of the development was revised from that stated on the application form. The revised description is agreed by both parties and therefore I have used that description in the header above.

Preliminary Matters

4. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration in my decision-making,

planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in the appeal are:

- The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.
- The effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.39 Homeway, with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on a residential road. Homeway is typically characterised by a mixture of detached and semi-detached two storey and single storey dwellings. A variety of dwelling designs and roof styles are present. Whilst there are some examples of pairs of semi-detached dwellings that feature similar designs and materials in their pairs, there are also a number of examples where variations in style and design occur. This includes the appeal property which has been extended previously so the pair of semi-detached dwellings are not identical. The variety in appearance of dwellings on Homeway contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
7. It is acknowledged that the proposal would result in a different roof shape at the appeal property and some degree of visual imbalance with the attached neighbouring property would occur. However, the half hip roof extension would not exceed the existing roof height and would be modest in scale, and so it would not appear dominant when viewed from Homeway. The use of matching materials would also help to assimilate it with the existing roof. Overall, I consider that it would not be so disruptive to the appearance and character of the pair of dwellings as to be unacceptable. Nor, given the variety of roof designs that exist along Homeway, would it be detrimental to the street scene.
8. The proposed rear dormer roof extension would be flat roofed and whilst it would add additional bulk and mass to the dwelling, it would not overly dominate the rear of the dwelling and would not be visible from the public highway.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene. It would accord with Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (Adopted 2008) (the 'Core Strategy') which seeks, amongst other things to ensure development maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area. Whilst the proposal would result in some unbalance with the attached neighbouring dwelling, it would not be to the extent that the character and appearance of the host dwelling or street scene

would be harmed. The proposal therefore accords with the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (the 'SPD') (Adopted 2011) which seeks to protect the characteristics of a house or street from unsuitable roof extensions.

Living Conditions

10. No. 39 Homeway (No. 39) is a detached bungalow located roughly to the west of the appeal property. The appeal dwelling has been extended close to the boundary with No. 39, a gate, side access path and wooden fence separate the bungalow from the common boundary.
11. Whilst the height of the roof of the existing two storey side extension would be increased to match the roof height of the original dwelling, it would be no closer to No.39 and the changes to the roof style would not harmfully change the outlook from the windows of the dwelling. There is already a disparity in height between the two dwellings and whilst the roof extension would add some additional bulk to the appeal property, I do not consider the proposed extension would be so large or prominent that it would significantly impact light levels, unduly dominate outlook or feel overbearing from No 39.
12. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy which seeks, amongst other things to prevent development that would result in the unacceptable loss of daylight. The proposal also accords with the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD which seeks to ensure developments do not unacceptably impact the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties, including daylight levels.

Other Matters

13. I have taken into account concerns from local residents including over-development at the appeal property, loss of privacy, loss of light and overshadowing.
14. With regard to concerns that the appeal property would be over developed, it is acknowledged that the proposal will increase the size of the dwelling, however it is not considered the increase will be significant or represent harmful over-development. Whilst I have noted the planning history of the appeal property, I must consider the proposals before me on its own merits.
15. With regard to the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 43 Homeway (No 43) the Council are satisfied that due to the proposed location of the half hipped roof on the opposite side to No. 43 that there would be no impact on levels of light or overshadowing of the occupiers and I agree with this conclusion. With regard to privacy, I also agree with the Council that in a built-up residential area such as this, mutual overlooking of back gardens is common and already occurs with the existing properties, I am therefore satisfied that any overlooking as a result of the proposed dormer would not be a significant issue. I am also content that no adverse effects on the living conditions of the occupiers of properties on Colchester Road (to the rear of the appeal property) will occur due to the distance of the appeal dwelling from these properties.

Conditions

16. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. Where necessary, and in the interests of clarity and precision, I have slightly altered the conditions to better reflect the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
17. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building to protect the character and appearance of the area.
18. The Council have suggested a condition preventing windows or other openings to be formed in the flank wall of the appeal property to protect the privacy of the neighbouring property. I have not included this suggested condition as the formation of windows in the flank wall will be prevented by the condition requiring the proposal to be in accordance with the approved plans and it is therefore unnecessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR