



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: 26 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/21/3282904

186 Collier Row Lane, Romford, RM5 3JB

- 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 A Ali against the decision of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0819.21, dated 27 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. There are 2 issues in this case: i) the effect of the development of the character and appearance of the host property, in terms of its height, mass, and depth; and ii) the effect on the street scene in respect of position and size.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling located at the junction of Collier Row Lane with Hillfoot Road. The surrounding area consists predominantly of semi-detached and terraced housing, with a mixture of houses and bungalows. Collier Row Lane, the B174, is wide with footways and open front gardens giving it a spacious feel. Hillfoot Road, looking from the junction, has an open character. At the junction, the appeal property has a significant space between it and the highway, whilst on the other side of the road there is a bungalow, again having space along its flank, albeit set behind a wall with a wavy top approximately 1.8m at its highest. Beyond this the footways and front gardens of the Hillfoot Road dwellings also afford a spacious feel.
4. The proposed single storey side extension to the appeal dwelling would be set back by only a small amount from the front elevation, and runs back the full length of that elevation – some 7m or so. It would fill the space between the house and the highway, with its flank wall at the back of the footway about 3m high (measured using the linear scale on the drawing) to the top of the parapet. Behind the parapet would be a gutter from which the mono-pitched roof rises to just under the height of the cill of the first floor windows, whilst the parapet itself is roughly at a level half way up the hipped roof of the front door porch. This description demonstrates the scale of the appeal proposal. I am led

to the judgement that the extension would have a height, mass, and depth which would make it a dominant and intrusive feature of the house, and in turn, harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling.

5. Turning to the second issue, the bulk of the extension and its height, the character of which I have described in paragraph 4 above, at the back of the footway on Hillfoot Road, would be an overbearing feature at the junction, and would be harmful to the open nature of the junction and street. I do not place any significant weight on the point in the officer's report that it would be forward of the building line since the host dwelling itself is already forward of the properties in Hillfoot Road.
6. I have taken note of the points made in the appellant's appeal statement that there is a variety of forms of development on corner locations in the wider area; that the external materials and detailing are suitable; that there would be no obstruction of views, vistas etc; and that the distinction between public and private realms would be maintained. However, these factors do not overcome the matters that have led to my decision.

Conclusion

7. The combination of the harm to both the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and to the street scene, as I have explained above, leads me to the conclusion that planning permission should not be given. For these reasons I shall dismiss the appeal.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR