The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2022

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/22/3298678
20 Great Nelmes Chase, Hornchurch RM11 2PT

- 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 Claire against the decision of the London Borough of Havering Council.
- The application Ref P1873.21, dated 27 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2022.
- The development proposed is alterations to dwelling by way of new roof/extensions and alterations to front facade.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues of the appeal are the effect of the proposal on:

    - The character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area; and
    - the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers, with reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal dwelling is a detached chalet type bungalow situated on the inside of a crank in the street at Great Nelmes Chase. This street is located in a wider residential area generally made up of tightly neighbouring detached 2 storey houses and bungalows on relatively small plots. It is located within the Emerson Park Policy Area, an area designated for its special residential character, this part of which is defined by medium sized family homes that exhibit a variety of architectural expressions.

4. The appeal dwelling stretches across much of the width of its plot, which appears from the front to be significantly wider than plots evident in the local area. However, due to the constraining effects of its side and rear boundary with 6 Chase House Gardens (No.6), the appeal plot is shallower and narrower to its rear. It has previously been the subject of extension and alteration, including a first floor extension over a pre-existing garage to form an attached residential annexe. This has a roof that steps down from that of the main

dwelling, with a covered passageway that provides access from the front to the rear garden, and the door to the annex.

5. The proposal would change the existing form of the appeal dwelling from a hipped chalet bungalow with dormer windows, to a two storey house with a variously hipped and gabled roof form. This would result in the existing garage and attached annexe, which currently appears as a subservient side wing to the appeal dwelling, being absorbed into a larger single house form, with the existing area of garage becoming a games room and part of the living space of this house.

6. The proposal would result in the roof of the appeal dwelling being a single unified roof height, 1.25 metres taller than the tallest part of the existing roof and would be over a greater extent of the dwelling, with hipped roof forms to the sides, reflecting the form of the sides of the existing roof. However, the proposal would also introduce significantly scaled gable ends to the front and rear elevations, which would not accord with the design guidance given for such development in the Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011). This would result in the massing of the proposed additional bulk being particularly prominent when viewed from the rear and from the side of the appeal dwelling that face towards properties on the neighbouring close at Chase House Gardens.

7. The proposed additional bulk resulting from the excessive scale of the proposal would be very apparent in local street and rear views. This would have the effect of making the appeal property appear significantly larger than the medium sized family homes found more generally within the local area. This would result in the extended and altered appeal dwelling appearing visually dominating within the context of its own shallow and constrained plot and also intrusive and incongruous within the context of the wider area. The proposal would also not, therefore, accord with the guidance given in the Emerson Park Policy Area Supplementary Planning Document (2009), which advises that no new development will be permitted unless its massing and architectural character are compatible with the character of the Emerson Park area.

Living Conditions

8. To the rear the appeal plot narrows considerably, due to the close proximity with the boundary to the side and rear of No.6, which fronts on to the adjacent close. This results in a narrow rear passageway between a significant length of the rear of the appeal dwelling and the boundary fence. No.6 is also positioned directly adjacent to the boundary between these two properties

9. Due to the extent and height of the proposed rear and roof extensions, the proposal would appear prominently in the outlook from the rear rooms and garden space of No.6. From these vantage points, owing to the excessive scale of the proposal, its gable ended roof forms, and the proximity of the appeal dwelling and No.6, the proposal would appear as intrusive with an overbearing presence. The proposal would, therefore, be experienced by the residential occupiers of No.6 as oppressive.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has raised issues in relation to pre-planning processes and advice given by the Council. These are not, however, matters for me to consider as

part of this appeal and there are other separate procedures that deal with such matters.

11. The appellant has also brought to my attention the use of the existing accommodation above the garage as an annexe. As this is not a planning matter that forms part of the main issues of this appeal, this is not a matter that I have given any significant weight in my considerations.

12. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would result in significant harm to the living conditions of the existing and future occupiers of No.6 and to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. This would be contrary to policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan (2021), which collectively seek to ensure that development is of high quality design, fully integrates with neighbouring developments, responds to the context of the site and the local distinctiveness and character of the area, and does not have an adverse effect on the quality of life of existing and future residents.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR