



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/23/3316897

71 Parkland Avenue, Havering, Upminster RM14 2EU

- 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 Rachel Clark against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1806.22 dated 15 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as single storey side and two storey rear extension, conversion of garage to cloak room and store area and the provision of additional flank windows and door with a double hip to gable roof alteration, rear dormer window and roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Appellant has drawn my attention to the Council citing Policy 27 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (2021) (the Local Plan) in the reason for refusal. Policy 27 relates to landscaping, the reason for refusal focuses on design and the effect of the development on the existing property and surrounding area. The 'Officer report for decision under delegated authority' referenced Policy 26 relating to urban design as being relevant to the proposed development, Policy 27 is not referred to in the report other than the reason for refusal.
3. The Appellant has set out clearly the grounds of appeal responding the report and reason for refusal which focus on the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and existing property. Taking a pragmatic approach, I do not believe that any party has been prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the existing property and the character and appearance of area.

Reasons

5. The site is within a predominantly residential area characterised typically by detached and semi-detached properties. Whilst there are varying designs of

properties in the immediate area there is a commonality of features such as hipped roofs.

6. I understand that many of the elements of the proposed development have recently been approved¹. In relation to the proposal before me the hip to gable roof alteration, rear dormer window and roof lights are new elements.
7. The Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (the SPD) confirms that extensions should respect and be subordinate to the original dwelling.
8. The recently approved development would alter the appearance of the property however the hip to gable roof alteration would erode the rhythm of the properties in the area. The rear dormer would be bulky and would not integrate well with the two storey rear extension. The increased massing of the building would be incongruous with the area in general.
9. The proposed development would in combination be disproportionate to the host property and at would be out of keeping with the prevailing characteristics of the area.
10. The Appellant has drawn my attention to other developments in the area, which have gable roof designs. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal. The prevailing character of the area maintains a harmony in terms of visual relationship. As such the proposed development would be out of keeping with the streetscene.
11. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the existing property and the character and appearance of area.
12. Whilst the reason for refusal contends that the proposed development is contrary to Policy 27 of the Local Plan I disagree, notwithstanding this there is conflict with Policy 26 of the Local Plan and SPD which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of high quality design which respect and complement distinctive local features of the site and reinforce and complement the local streetscene.

Conclusion

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

C Pipe

INSPECTOR

¹ Application Reference: P1094.22 relating to single storey side and two storey rear extension, conversion of garage to cloak room and store area and the provision of additional flank windows and door