

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2022

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4TH October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/22/3293747

4 Homeway, Romford RM3 0HD

- 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 McGuiness (Major Group Developments Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P2198.21, dated 8 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft and rear extension at 4 Homeway, Romford RM3 0HD. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P2198.21, dated 8 November 2021, subject to the following 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 not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the following approved plans: 1506_330 (location plan), 1506_331 (block plan), 1506_332 (site plan) and 1506_334_A (floor plans, elevations and indicative section).
 - 3) All new external finishes shall be in materials to match those of the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council previously granted planning permission for a single storey rear extension¹ and issued a Certificate of Lawfulness for a single storey side extension² to the appeal property. The walls of these extensions had been completed at the time of the inspection. The rear extension is the same depth as that in this proposal. Therefore, the principal issue in this appeal in accordance with these facts and the Council's decision notice is the effect of the proposed loft extension.

¹ Ref P0959.21

² Ref D0125.21

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed loft extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 6 Homeway, with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow in a residential road of mixed dwelling types. The surrounding area is residential in character.
5. Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (2021) and Policies D1, D3 and D4 of The London Plan 2021 all concern good design and include the requirements that development should be of high architectural quality and respond to the existing character of an area.
6. The original dwelling prior to the development that has been undertaken was a modest detached bungalow with a hipped roof form. The extensions that have been undertaken have already altered this to some degree and in combination with the new hipped/crown roof would result in a substantially larger building of greater bulk and mass. However, while not unattractive, the original bungalow had limited architectural merit in its own right and the drawings show that the proposed extensions would result in a proportionate and well-designed dwelling.
7. My understanding is that the approved side and rear extensions would have flat roofs. The side extension in particular seen from the front would appear incongruous in this regard in relation to the original roof form of the dwelling. Given that the approved extensions are partly built and represent a 'fallback' to the appeal proposal, I consider that the proposed loft conversion would be an improvement in design terms and the resultant appearance of the extended dwelling. As such, despite the material changes involved the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the existing dwelling's character and appearance.
8. The dwellings either side of the appeal property are detached bungalows with limited roof profiles. The extended dwelling would be more prominent in the street scene as a result of its position between these single storey dwellings. However, the wider street scene displays limited uniformity as it includes a range of dwelling types and sizes, including two storey dwellings and some, such as No 3 directly opposite the appeal site, which have wide frontages and a prominent roof profile. Consequently, the extended dwelling would not be uncharacteristic or incongruous within the street scene.
9. Therefore, taking these findings as a whole, I conclude that the proposed loft extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, the proposal is not contrary to Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 and Policies D1, D3 and D4 of The London Plan 2021, as described above.

Living Conditions

10. The neighbouring dwelling, No 6, is of limited depth and the extended appeal property would project beyond the conservatory to the rear of No 6. However, as I saw at the inspection, a generous gap is retained between No 4's side

elevation and the shared boundary. Moreover, the relative pitch of the hipped roof to the side would reduce the effects of the additional height beyond No 6's rear building line. In combination, these mitigating factors would mean that the increased height and mass created by the extensions would not be seen as dominant or overbearing by the neighbouring occupier.

11. Consequently, I conclude that there would be no material harm caused to the neighbouring occupiers' living conditions. There is, therefore, no conflict with Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031, which states that the Council will support developments that do not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook.

Other Matters

12. I have had regard to the representations on behalf of the occupier of the neighbouring dwelling, No 2. The roof lights on the extended dwelling would not, however, enable views into this neighbouring dwelling or its garden and, therefore, there would be no loss of privacy.

Conclusion and Conditions

13. I have found in the appellant's favour with regard to the main issues and, therefore, for the reasons given the appeal should succeed.
14. 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.
15. The Council suggests a further condition to control any additional windows in the flank elevations of the extended dwelling. However, additional ground floor windows would not result in a loss of privacy due to their level and boundary screening between properties, while further rooflights would not facilitate direct views towards neighbouring properties. For this reason, the suggested condition restricting permitted development rights concerning window installation is not necessary in circumstances where there is not clear justification to do so³.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR

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