



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1ST September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/22/3297573

184 Elm Park Avenue, Hornchurch RM12 4RY

- 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 S Gul against the decision of the London Borough of Havering Council.
 - The application Ref P2353.21, dated 14 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is extensions to side and rear ground and first floors and internal alterations
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a corner plot at the junction of Elm Park Avenue and Diban Avenue. The appeal dwelling is an end of terrace two storey house on an irregularly sized plot, with front and rear gardens that connect via a narrow side passageway along the angled boundary of the appeal property with Diban Avenue as the appeal property widens to the rear.
4. Diban avenue forms part of a clear boundary between the wider residential area of similar terraced properties, where the regular design and scale of the terraced houses result in a coherent character and appearance, and the commercial area focused on The Broadway and Elm Park Underground Station. The appeal property is widely visible from that part of Elm Park Avenue that forms part of this commercial area and its shops and local services.
5. The proposed extensions, which also includes a replacement single storey front porch, would wrap around the existing property. To the side and rear, the proposed extensions either build from or replace existing extensions. The proposed side extension would be set back from the original front elevation of the appeal dwelling and would be wider than the existing ground floor side extension, connecting at ground and first floor levels with

the proposed rear extension, which would likewise be wider than the existing rear extension. Above most of the side and rear extensions a hipped roof form is proposed that would engage with and reflect the design, form and angles of the roof of the original house.

6. It is evident that the appellant has sought to reflect the design of the original house in their proposal, and to rationalise the irregular angles of existing extensions. However, the proposal would result in the appeal dwelling appearing as a significantly larger house in relation to existing, and also in comparison to the coherent scale and appearance of the houses in the local area.
7. When viewed from the rear, Diban Avenue and the local shopping area on Elm Park Avenue, the proposed extensions would appear to be over scaled in relation to the appeal dwelling and would not appear as subservient additions. This would result in the proposal having an unduly prominent and dominating presence in local views, within the context of the coherent character of the local residential area.
8. Due to their proposed width, both the side and rear elements of the proposal would have their frontmost corners directly touching the boundary of the appeal property with Diban Avenue. The proposal would also remove the existing connection between the front and rear gardens and the separating distance between the appeal property and the boundary.
9. This would result in the flank wall of the appeal dwelling having a stepped design in relation to the angled boundary of the appeal property adjacent to the footway on this side of Diban Avenue. Given the proximity of the proposal to the boundary of the public highway, the two storey flank wall resulting from the proposed extensions would have an overbearing and intrusive presence when experienced by users of the footway adjacent.
10. It is noted that whilst the building on the other side of Diban Avenue is one storey taller than the appeal dwelling, it relates to the scale and the character and appearance of the commercial area. It is also set back significantly set back from Diban Avenue, behind an access road that runs parallel to the street. It does not therefore, have the same incongruous and intrusive appearance and overbearing presence that would result from the proposal.
11. The appellant has brought to my attention extensions at 106 (No.106) and 292 (No.292) Elm Park Avenue, however, no further details of these extensions has been provided. Whilst these extensions do extend to the boundary of their respective sites with the public highway, what appears to be a two storey extension at No. 292 seems to be of some age and the extension at No.106 is set back at first floor level and does not, therefore, reflect the form of the proposal. These extensions would have been considered on their own merits at the time they were approved, and I have done likewise with the proposal. I have therefore given only little weight to these existing developments in my considerations.

Planning Policy and Conclusion

12. Whilst the Council have set out in their decision notice that the proposal would not accord with policy D1 of the London Plan (2021), this policy

relates to the development of local plan policy by London boroughs and not their assessment of individual development proposals. I have not, therefore considered the proposal in relation to this policy.

13. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would be incongruous in relation to the appeal dwelling and would result in it being overbearing in relation to the local street scene and would not reflect the established character of the local area. The proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. This would conflict with policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan (2021) and policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), which collectively seek to ensure that development is of high quality design, fully integrates with neighbouring developments and responds to the context of the site and the local distinctiveness and character of the area.
14. As no public benefits have been identified that would outweigh this finding, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR