



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/22/3311242

51 Lawns Way, Romford, RM5 3TH

- 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 & Mrs Juozapavicius against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1294.22, dated 7 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as Demolition of Existing Detached Garage. Proposed Ground Floor Front, Side and Rear Extension with Roof Alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Demolition of Existing Detached Garage. Proposed Ground Floor Front, Side and Rear Extension with Roof Alterations at 51 Lawns Way, Romford, RM5 3TH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P1294.22, dated 7 August 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; Block/Site Plan (existing); Block/Site Plan (proposed); RM5THPP1; RM5THPP3; RM5THPP4; and RM5THPP5.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow which is sited within an irregular shaped corner plot at the junction of Lawns Way and The Drive. It is located in a row of semi-detached and detached bungalows along both road frontages although the wider surrounding area is more mixed in character comprising of bungalows, chalets and two storey houses.

4. The existing dwelling has a simple hipped roof design. It has a gable on its front elevation and a single storey flat roof projection to the rear. The site is partially screened from adjacent roads by a high hedge.
5. The shallow area beneath the existing overhang on the front elevation would be filled in and would be level with the existing front gable which would be retained. The proposed side extension would be level with the existing front gable and the proposed infill front extension. It would incorporate a new gable on its front elevation which would match the design, scale and proportions of the existing gable. The side extension would continue beyond the main rear wall of the existing dwelling but would not extend beyond the existing rear projection. The eaves and ridge height of the dwelling would remain the same but the existing hipped roof would be replaced by a half hipped roof structure.
6. The Council's Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (SPD) provides useful design guidance. It states, amongst other things, that where the Council has control over such proposals and hipped roofs form a characteristic of the house and/or street, a gable end will not be considered.
7. Whilst most of the neighbouring properties have a hipped roof, there are also examples of dwellings with gable ends and half hips particularly along Lawns Way, including at No 50 opposite the site. Front gables also feature strongly throughout the area which provide a visual contrast to the hipped roof forms. I noted at my site visit that Lawns Way slopes gently down towards its junction with The Drive such that the appeal property is on lower ground. Whilst the extension would extend slightly forward of 53 Lawns Way, given the single storey nature of the dwelling and its position on lower ground, I do not consider that the proposed extensions, including the half-hipped roof form, would appear unduly prominent or visually intrusive in the street scene.
8. Furthermore, when viewed in the context of the surrounding development where front gables are a defining feature, I find that the half hip roof form would not appear out of character, particular given its siting at an angle to the neighbouring dwellings where it would also be viewed in context with the front gable on 53 and 55 Lawns Way.
9. The SPD also advises that detached houses should not be extended up to side boundaries since this would involve closing the characteristic spacing between dwellings and leave no access to the rear.
10. The rear section of the extension would be angled to follow the alignment of the side boundary of the appeal site and would abut it. However, given that the proposed extension would be single storey and that most of the flank wall of the proposed extension would taper away from boundary, I am satisfied that sufficient space would be retained around the dwelling to ensure that the spaciousness of the street scene would not be compromised. In addition, pedestrian access to the rear of the dwelling would be retained adjacent to the other flank elevation.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Thus, it would comply with Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan (2016-2031) 2021, Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021 and the SPD which collectively seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR