



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: 18 May 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/22/3311238

Sundra & Park View, Horndon Road, ROMFORD RM5 3HB

- 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 Charlotte Gilbert against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1241.22 dated 01 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as Joint householder application for a roof extension to create a second floor with terrace to both semi detached dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of area; and (ii) the living conditions of occupiers of the adjoining properties.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The site is a pair of semi-detached properties within a predominantly residential area characterised by properties of regular designs. The application site and the adjacent semi-detached properties are a different design to the surrounding properties. The application site shares similar features to the adjacent semi-detached properties for instance both pairs are two storey, with a flat roof enclosed by a parapet and railings. Whilst they have had alterations for instance windows and porch/canopy's etc they retain a harmony in terms of appearance.
4. The symmetry of semi-detached properties is an important consideration. Whilst the proposed development would increase the height of the semi-detached properties forming the appeal site and would retain a harmony to the properties, the extension would not be subservient to the existing properties and would be dominant and incongruous to the surrounding area.
5. The proposed development would be a bulky prominent addition to the properties which would be out of keeping with the adjacent properties which shares similar design features.

6. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of area. There is conflict with Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (2021) (the Local Plan) which amongst other things seek to ensure developments are of high quality design which complement the local streetscene.
7. There is also conflict with the Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011) which seek to ensure amongst other things that developments are complementary to the existing dwelling and area.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed development would increase the height of the properties and would be visually bulky in the streetscene. Notwithstanding this the increase in scale would not be overbearing to the occupiers of adjacent properties enjoying their rear gardens.
9. I find that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining properties.
10. The reason for refusal contends there would be conflict with Policy 26 of the Local Plan in terms of the effect of the development on the amenity of the adjoining occupiers. However, I disagree Policy 26 relates to urban design. Policy 7 of the Local Plan seeks amongst other things to protect the amenity of existing and future residents.

Conclusion

11. I have found that the proposed development would not harm to the living conditions of adjoining properties, however this does not outweigh the harm I have identified in terms of the character and appearance of the area.
12. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR