



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: 19 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/23/3317721

15 Grosvenor Road, Havering, Romford RM7 0QU

- 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 Miss Ledia Rama against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0771.22 dated 12 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single and first floor infill extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, and 2 front roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Ms Ledia Rama against the Council of the London Borough of Havering. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the amended description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted the amended description in the heading above.
4. At the time of my site visit, the works to the roof and single storey extension had commenced with most of the built form erected. I understand that a single storey extension has been approved¹ and that the Council issues a certificate of lawfulness for the works to the roof².

Main Issues

5. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on (i) the character of the area and the host property; and (ii) the living conditions of occupiers of No. 17 Grosvenor Road.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

¹ Application Reference: P1932.21

² Application Reference: D0522.21

6. The site is a semi-detached property within a predominantly residential area. Semi-detached properties in the area share common features including rear two storey outriggers.
7. There is a regularity to the roof form in the immediate area, the proposed works to the roof are substantial projecting above the existing roof ridge of the existing two storey outrigger. The scale and form of the development is dominant and out of keeping with the host property and surrounding area. Notwithstanding this a certificate of lawfulness has been issued by the Council relating to this element of the proposal.
8. The first floor extension above the single storey extension previously approved has a flat roof which is uncharacteristic for the area. The mass of the combined works would be out of keeping with the area and existing property. I find that the scale and design of the proposed development incongruous to the host property and would appear bulky and stark in the surrounding area.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character of the area and the host property. There is conflict with policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (2021) (the Local Plan) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of high quality which complement the local streetscene and respond to local building form.
10. There is also conflict with the Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011) (the SPD) which confirms that extensions should respect and be subordinate to the original dwelling.

Living Conditions

11. Windows face the appeal site from No. 17 Grosvenor Road. The area between the adjacent two storey outriggers, No. 17 and the appeal site, is constrained.
12. The SPD contains guidelines that two storey rear extensions should be set in from the common boundary with any attached dwelling by not less than 2 metres, and should project no more than 3 metres, unless there are exceptional local circumstances, where a 4m extension maybe allowed. The SPD also confirms that an equivalent degree of amenity should be secured for the neighbouring dwelling on the non-attached boundary.
13. The Council in the 'Officer report for decision under delegated authority' confirm that the proposed development would not comply with the SPD due to the two storey rear extension not being set in at least 2m from the shared boundary.
14. Whilst the proposed development would comply with the SPD in terms of projection the amenity of No. 17 would be compromised.
15. I find that the works to the roof and first floor extension are significant in scale and in combination would provide a sense of enclosure to the occupiers of the neighbouring property No. 17 due to the tunnelling effect that the development would create. The scale and mass of the proposed development would be dominant, overbearing and oppressive to the occupiers of No. 17 Grosvenor Road.
16. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupiers of No. 17 Grosvenor Road. There is conflict with Policy 7 of the Local

Plan and the SPD which amongst other things seeks to protect the amenity of existing and future residents.

Conclusion

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

C Pipe

INSPECTOR