



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2021

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/21/3281023

35 Pettits Lane, Romford RM1 4HH

- 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 David Long against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0603.21, dated 29 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2021.
 - The development is for a proposed dormer extension with loft conversion including bedroom and en suite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed dormer extension with loft conversion including bedroom and en suite at 35 Pettits Lane, Romford RM1 4HH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P0603.21, dated 29 March 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: site location plan, 35PL/03, 35PL/04, 35PL/05, 35PL/08, 35PL/016
 - 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material and colour those of the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the determination of the application by the Council the Havering Local Plan November 2021 (LP) has been adopted. This has superseded all policies contained in the Council's Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008). I have determined the appeal on the basis of the newly adopted LP.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling with off-street parking spaces to the front, sited on the western side of Pettits Lane. The surrounding area is residential in nature.

5. I note that the appeal dwelling is not locally or statutorily listed and the site is not located in a conservation area. There is no prevailing architectural style; the neighbourhood is characterised by dwellings of various size, appearance and detailing. At my site visit I saw a number of other dormer windows in the roofslopes of dwellings in the vicinity.
6. I acknowledge that the appeal proposal would be a fairly substantial development within the rear roofslope of the host dwelling. Nevertheless, the scheme would be set within the body of the roof; below the main ridgeline, above the eaves and with the sides set away from the gable end and party wall with the adjacent property. Taken together with the other dormer windows that are clearly visible from the appeal site, I am of the view that the scheme would not detract from the character of the setting.
7. I accept that the proposed design solution integrating the dormer window and the pitched roof of the existing two-storey outrigger would be unusual. However, I have taken into account the myriad design features at the rear of properties in the area and the overall lack of uniformity between built form. On balance, I consider that the juxtaposition of the dormer and outrigger is not sufficiently harmful as to warrant dismissal of the appeal on this ground.
8. I am therefore of the view that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area. It would accord with Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2021, the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and policy D1 of the London Plan 2021, which seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance.

Conditions

9. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. Additionally materials are required to match the existing building in order to ensure that the external appearance of the proposal is satisfactory.

Conclusion

10. Based on the above and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal succeeds.

C Hall

INSPECTOR