



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2022

by C Harding BA(Hons) PGDipTRP PGCert MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/22/3291485

6 Locke Close, Rainham, RM13 7LD

- 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 Carlo Alberto D'Aiuto against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Havering.
 - The application ref P1808.21, dated 16 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Locke Close is a small cul-de-sac set on the edge of a wider area of residential dwellings. The character of the street is reflective of others around it, in that it comprises semi-detached dwellings with a regular scale and form, albeit with some later alterations and additions. The small number of properties within the cul-de-sac has resulted in a particularly close-knit character to the street, with rhythm being established by common features such as first storey bay windows.
4. The proposed development, in comprising a two-storey extension with hipped roof, would significantly alter the appearance of the principal elevation of the host property as a result of its depth, width and height. The proposed development would be located directly adjacent to existing bay windows at both ground and first floor levels, and project beyond them. The ground and first storey bay windows are currently the primary feature of the front elevation of the property and the proposed extension would compete visually with these features to an unacceptable degree. Whilst the height of the proposed extension would be subordinate to the host dwelling, and its width less than half of the overall front elevation, it would nevertheless result in the front elevation appearing overdeveloped and unbalanced.

5. Additionally, despite the materials, fenestration and roof form matching the existing dwelling, the proposed development would appear as prominent within the streetscene. This is due to the scale and design of the proposed extension and the otherwise generally consistent appearance of front elevations within the street. Other existing alterations, such as those at no.8 Locke Close comprise either single storey porches or two-storey side extensions, and importantly do not disrupt the rhythm of the first storey bay windows, which are a common feature of properties in the street. Consequently, the character of the cul-de-sac would be disrupted.
6. As such, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposed development would therefore be in conflict with London Borough of Havering Development Control Policies DPD¹ Policy 26 which seeks to ensure that new development is of a high quality design which respects, reinforces and complements the distinctiveness of the local area and streetscene.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has referred to examples of similar developments, which I was able to view on my site visit. However, these are located on a different street and would not be visible from the appeal site. Consequently, they do not provide a visual context for the proposed development or contribute to the character of Locke Close. Therefore, the presence of these examples would not diminish the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.
8. I acknowledge that the potential effect of the development upon living conditions is not a matter of dispute. However even if I were to agree that the scheme would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring properties, this would be a neutral factor, and would not weigh in favour of the scheme.

Conclusion

9. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
10. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed

C Harding

INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008