



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/22/3308343

4 Kings Road, Havering, Romford RM1 2ST

- 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 Ms S Vajushi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1237.22 dated 27 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is as built loft conversion with rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, the proposed wall was in place. The application made clear that the scheme had been submitted retrospectively and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of host property and area in general.

Reasons

4. The site is within a predominantly residential area, characterised by properties of varying design and style. The appeal property is a modest two storey semi-detached property.
5. The Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (the SPD) confirms that extensions should respect and be subordinate to the original dwelling. In terms of dormer windows the SPD highlights these should face the rear garden, and should be contained well within the body of the roof, by amongst other things being set well back from the eaves, gables and party walls. Windows should relate to the windows of the original house in proportion, design and position.
6. I observed during my site visit that the development does not comply with most of the guidelines set out in the SPD.
7. The large dormer on the outrigger exceeds the outrigger roof ridge. The smaller dormer projects slightly forward from the main rear elevation above UPVC soffit board. The mass of the dormers are uncharacteristic in comparison

to other dormers within the area. I find that the scale and design of the rear dormers are incongruous to the host property and appears as bulky and stark features in the surrounding area.

8. Other properties in the immediate area have rooflights visible from the front of the property, the rooflights within the development do not look out of place. Notwithstanding this the rooflights are not severable physically nor functionally from the loft conversion development before me.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of host property and area in general. There is conflict with Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (2021) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of high quality design which respect and complement the site and local area.

Other Matters

10. I understand that the Appellant submitted an application for a certificate of lawful development for the works believing that they would fall within permitted development rights. Whilst there was a delay in the Council issuing the decision that planning permission was required, this does not persuade me that the development should be allowed.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR