

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/21/3285085

2 Harrow Crescent, Romford RM3 7AB

- 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 Amarjit Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1473.21, dated 26 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey side extension, loft conversion with front and rear dormers and change of front door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey side extension, loft conversion with front and rear dormers and change of front door at 2 Harrow Crescent, Romford RM3 7AB. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P1473.21, dated 26 July 2021, subject to the conditions included in the schedule at Annexe A.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has provided an update to the officer's report, concerning the effect on the neighbouring dwelling, No 2b. The original report incorrectly stated that there are no windows in the side elevation of No 2b, when in fact there are three. I note, however, that the Council's assessment of the effect of the proposed development on this neighbouring dwelling does not change or add to its reason for refusal.

Main Issue

3. The Council has not raised any concerns about the side extension, front dormers or front door and I agree that these elements of the proposal would not be harmful. Consequently, the main issue is the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow in a residential road of mixed dwelling types. The surrounding area is residential in character.
-

5. Policy DC61 of the Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008) concerns urban design and states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area.
6. The *Residential Extensions and Alterations* Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) says that dormer windows should normally be located facing the rear garden so they are not visible from the street and do not harm the appearance or character of the original house. Dormers should be contained well within the body of the roof, by being set well back from the eaves, and by setting the sides well in from any gables or party walls. Dormers must never extend above the ridge line of the roof and should be located well below it. All windows at roof level, particularly dormers, should relate to the windows of the original house in proportion, design and position¹.
7. There are examples of rear dormer windows on properties close to No 2 and, therefore, the principle of a dormer to the rear is in keeping with the character of the surrounding area. These existing examples appear to be positioned on semi-detached dwellings and, as such, are not as wide as the proposed dormer. However, the dormer would be set well down from the roof ridge, in from the sides and up from the eaves. Moreover, the windows would be proportionate and appropriate to the overall design and appearance of the rear elevation.
8. Therefore, taking these findings as a whole, the proposed dormer would comply with the guidance in the SPD as it would be proportionate to the rear roof slope and not uncharacteristic of the surrounding area. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed rear dormer would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. As such, the proposal is not contrary to Policy DC61 of the Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008) or to the SPD, as described above.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. I have found in the appellant's favour with regard to the main issue and, therefore, for the reasons given the appeal should succeed.
10. Of the Council's suggested conditions I have imposed the standard time condition and, to ensure the proper implementation of development in accordance with the submitted details, one requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I agree that a condition requiring external materials to match those of the existing dwelling is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
11. As the approved development involves a loft conversion it is possible that windows could be installed in the side elevations at a later date. However, upper floor windows installed as permitted development would be required to include obscured glass and be non-opening to a prescribed level². Additional ground floor windows would not result in a loss of privacy due to their lower level and boundary screening between properties. For this reason, the

¹ Paragraphs 8.2 and 8.3.

² The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 1, A.3(b).

suggested condition restricting permitted development rights concerning window installation is not necessary in circumstances where there is not clear justification to do so³.

12. The flat-roofed single storey element to the rear created by the extensions could be used for amenity purposes and, therefore, I agree that a condition prohibiting this is necessary to protect neighbouring occupiers' privacy. The Council also suggests that the ground floor windows adjacent to No 4 should include obscured glass and be non-opening except for a fanlight. However, as one of these windows serves a bathroom and there is another bathroom on the upper floor I have amended the condition to reflect the need for privacy in these rooms. The other side ground floor window would serve a stairwell rather than a habitable room and so there is no need for this to include obscured glass.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR

Annexe A

Schedule – conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan, ZAAVIA/2HC/102A (proposed plans), ZAAVIA/2HC/104B (proposed elevations), ZAAVIA/2HC/105A (proposed roof plan) and ZAAVIA/2HC/107A (proposed site plan).
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions and alterations hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 4) The flat-roofed element to the rear created by the extensions hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the local planning authority.
- 5) The windows serving bathrooms as shown on the approved plans shall be permanently glazed with obscured glass not less than level 4 on the standard scale of obscurity and shall thereafter be maintained and permanently fixed shut, with the exception of any top hung fanlight(s), and thereafter maintained.

[End of Schedule]

³ As required by paragraph 54 of the National Planning Policy Framework.