



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/22/3309096

71 Macdonald Avenue, Havering, Hornchurch, RM11 2NF

- 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 Haseeb Baig against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0896.22, dated 30 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey ground floor side extension.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, end of terraced dwelling occupying a corner, wedge-shaped site where Macdonald Avenue turns sharply in a north-westerly direction and at an acute angle. The dwelling has previously been extended to the side and rear at two-storey, with the outside corner of the rear extension abutting the back edge of the pavement along the site's angled, side return boundary. The area is residential in character but with a marked change in appearance between the south-westerly orientated part of Macdonald Avenue and the stretch which runs in a north-westerly direction. The former, to which the appeal property faces, is lined on both sides with two-storey, terraced homes of similar age and style, with reasonably shallow frontages, creating a fairly contained vista along its length. By contrast, when turning into the north-westerly orientated stretch at the junction where the appeal property is positioned, there is a striking change with properties to one side comprising pairs of bungalows, with the opposite side overtly spacious, defined by the deep rear gardens of dwellings which back on to each other.
4. The proposal is to construct a single-storey, flat roof extension to the side of the appeal property and which would fill the existing wedge-shaped space between the flank wall of the extended dwelling and the side boundary with Macdonald Avenue. The extension would run contiguous with the front elevation of the property and would run along the back edge of the pavement,

tapering to a narrow width at the rear which would align with the property's original rear elevation.

5. The Council's *Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) March 2011* provides design guidance for residential extensions and alterations. It advises that side extensions are highly visible from the street and that they should be carefully designed so not to detract from Havering's open and spacious character. It further advises that single-storey side extensions should normally be set back from the main building line to create a break in the façade and that the flank wall of side extensions to corner properties must be set back at least one metre from the back edge of the footway. The appeal proposal would be neither recessed behind the front wall of the house or set back from the footway and would therefore fail to follow the Council's normal guidelines in this regard.
6. The appellant argues that, due to the limited width of the proposed extension and the fact it would be set in approximately 3.5m from the existing rear building line of the dwelling, the proposal would not be dominant or visually intrusive when viewed in the street scene. I disagree. Although the existing extended form of No 71 currently adjoins the back edge of the footpath, this is at a single pinch-point. In my assessment, the residual space to the side of the dwelling contributes positively to the spatial qualities of the area, particularly when turning the corner to the front of No 71 where the more open aspect to the north-west oriented limb of Macdonald Avenue is appreciated. This benefit would be lost from a side extension that would be highly visible and prominent in the street scene, further contrary to the SPD, and cramped in its setting, thereby out of keeping with the established character of the area.
7. The incongruous presence of the extension would be further exaggerated by its failure to be recessed behind the forward building line, thereby creating an overwide and disjointed elevation without any relief from a break in the façade.
8. I note the Council's reference to an appeal decision dated January 2022 for 1 Primrose Glen nearby (Ref APP/B5480/D/21/3283039) but this has had no bearing on my assessment of the current appeal proposal.
9. For the reasons given, I find that due to its size and siting, the extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such it would conflict with Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (HLP), adopted in 2021, by failing to display the quality of design required to respect the identity and character of the area. I cannot detect any conflict with HLP Policy 7, which seeks to specifically protect the amenity of residents, but the development plan conflict and harm that I have identified means that the appeal should fail. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR