
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2023

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/22/3309460

Ponderosa, New Road, Havering, Rainham RM13 9PL

- 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 Mustafa Kamal against the decision of London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1160.22, dated 14 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is alterations to the roof and front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling with a saltbox style roof design, including four dormer windows in the front roof plane. The area near to the property in New Road is predominately residential in character. Whilst the appeal property is of a two-storey form to the rear, when it is viewed from the road, it is one of a number of smaller-scale properties positioned on an angle to the western side of the road, and within plots that have gardens or off-street parking to the front and gardens to the rear. The appeal property marks the end of that passage of development, with two storey properties on Lambs Lane South backing on the appeal site.
4. The appeal scheme would increase the scale and massing of the dwelling considerably, particularly to the front. The resultant property would appear dominant and out of step with the modest scale, form, massing and design of properties on the western side of New Road extending towards Haven Road. The proposal would also harm the transition that the appeal property provides between the low-scale passage of development on New Road and that of properties on Lambs Lane South to the rear.
5. I recognise that the proposal would make effective use of the plot and that the appellant seeks to carry out positive changes to the property. However, in my view, notwithstanding the retention of many of the existing fenestrations, the proposed design would not harmonise with the property's existing architectural style as it would replace it with a form of architecture that would appear dominant and out of step with the modest scale, form, massing and design of

properties on the western side of New Road extending towards Haven Road. The fundamental changes to the property's scale and massing would be evident from New Road on approach to the site. Whilst there are various designs, styles and finishes on New Road, I do not consider that the proposed alterations would be modest and complementary to the street scene. Unlike other properties referred to by the appellant, the appeal property is at an angle to the road which means that the whole front façade would be evident on approach to the site from the north-west.

6. Balanced against the proposal's harmful scale, massing and design is the beneficial additional living space that the alterations would provide for the occupants. The proposal would also not cause harm in respect of neighbouring occupants' living conditions by reason of privacy, outlook or sun and daylight due to the orientation and separation of the appeal property and neighbouring properties. The proposal would also not be overbearing to neighbouring occupants for the same reason, and adequate garden provision would remain. However, these matters do not alter or outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.
7. Although the appellant considers the appeal scheme to be the most appropriate design for the property, it remains open to them to propose an alternative to the Council in the first instance.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and therefore the proposal would conflict with Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016 - 2031, Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document. These policies and guidance seek, among other things, development to be of a high architectural quality and design, and to respect, reinforce and complement the local street scene in terms of the established scale and massing.
9. The Council refer to London Plan Policy D1 in its reason for refusal, but this policy is not relevant in this case as it relates to the development plan process and carrying out area assessments to define places in the plan area.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development would not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a different decision other than in accordance with this. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR