



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2022

by Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/21/3283039

1 Primrose Glen, Hornchurch, RM11 2NL

- 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 B Dhami against the decision of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0835.21, dated 29 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is ground floor and first floor side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The single issue in this case is the effect of the extensions on the appearance of the surrounding area and street scene in terms of bulk, mass, and their relationship with the existing dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is of 2 storeys and is part of a terrace on the south-eastern side of Primrose Glen. It is the end house, at the junction of Primrose Glen with MacDonald Avenue. Primrose Glen meets MacDonald Avenue at a slight angle, so that, whilst the front north-east corner of the house is close to the boundary at the back edge of the MacDonald footway, the area within the curtilage along this boundary gradually widens. The gap at the front of the house is approximately 2.3m wide¹, whilst at the rear elevation this increases to some 4.5m wide. This boundary with MacDonald Avenue is currently marked by a high concrete panel fence.
4. The proposed ground floor extension runs along the boundary, immediately behind the footway, for a greater length than the existing dwelling itself. The new ground floor flank wall would extend for about 13.5m along the footway. In as much as it would replace the concrete panel fence, it would be a little more intrusive in the street scene than the fence, although the mono-pitch roof (running up to a flat roof on the majority of the extension) would clearly give

¹ All dimensions are taken from the application plans using the linear scale provided since there are no individual dimensions noted on the drawings.

the impression of a substantial structure, have a greater perceived effect on the streetscene.

5. The front of the proposed first floor extension would be set almost on the boundary with MacDonald Avenue, and would run back some 8.5m to its rear elevation. At the rear corner it would be some 4.5m from the back edge of the MacDonald Avenue footway.
6. The combined effect of the proposed ground and first floor extensions would be that of a dominating structure, set immediately behind/close to the back edge of the footway. Although the rear elevation of the first floor extension would be set off the boundary, due to the angle I have previously described, it would also have a considerable impact on the streetscene when viewed along MacDonald Avenue from the south-east. The totality of the proposals would fail to relate to, and would be out of proportion with, the existing dwelling.
7. In total I consider that the combined effect of the proposals would be dominant and visually intrusive in the street scene. This would run against the emphasis on good design in the National Planning Policy Framework and the planning policies for the borough and London. It would not enhance or improve the character of the area and would therefore be contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and Policy D4 of the London Plan.
8. I have taken account of all other matters, including examples of developments in Birch Crescent and Cecil Avenue: I looked at these during my site visit. However, each case is different and must be decided on its own merits. I have also noted representations by interested persons about other development within the curtilage of the appeal property. However, my decision is based entirely on the nature of the appeal proposal, including its bulk and mass and its relationship with the public realm immediately outside its curtilage. For the reasons I have given, the appeal is dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR