



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/23/3319904

3 Garland Way, Hornchurch RM11 2SX

- 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 Mrs I Cole against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref p1864.22, dated 14 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "*single storey rear part first floor rear, double storey side and front extension with alterations to main façade*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposals on:
 - (i) the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and
 - (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Garland Way, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached house with an attached garage to one side and a conservatory to the rear. It is located in a residential area and forms part of an informally laid out group of houses of similar age that are set back from Garland Way behind mature vegetation. Whilst these properties have been extended and altered over time, they retain their original dual-pitched roof form, a feature that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the group of houses and is evident in views from Garland Way.
4. The proposal would comprise the removal of the garage and the erection of 2-storey additions to the front and side and a part-single and part 2-storey extension to the rear. The double-storey front addition and the hipped roof forms to the side and rear would be entirely alien and incongruous elements in this context and would result in a house that would be out of keeping with its neighbours.

5. Due to their bulk, height, form and design I conclude that the proposed extensions would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore fails to accord with Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan (2021) (HLP) which, amongst other things, seeks high quality design and requires development to respond to distinctive local building forms, respecting visual integrity and established rhythms. There is also conflict with many of the general design principles set out in the Council's *Residential Extensions and Alterations* Supplementary Planning Document (2011).

Living Conditions

6. At present there is single-storey garage adjacent to the boundary with 1 Garland Way, with the main bulk and height of the appeal property set away from the boundary. To a degree the existing situation restricts outlook from the nearest ground floor window in the rear of No.1 and encloses the space immediately outside this window.
7. The proposal would replace the garage with a 2-storey side addition that would protrude a similar distance beyond the rear building line of No.1. In addition, a single-storey element would protrude further into the rear garden. The combined effect of this development along the boundary shared with No.1 would be to further restrict outlook from the rear of No.1 and the area of garden immediately to the rear of the house. This would be exacerbated by the 2-storey part of the rear extension which, although set away from the shared boundary, would add to the sense of enclosure at the rear of No.1.
8. I conclude on this matter that, due to its height, bulk and siting the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.1. The proposal therefore fails to accord with HLP Policy 7 which, amongst other things, advises that development will be supported that does not result in unacceptable loss of outlook.

Other Matters

9. Reference has been made to 2 recent appeal decisions relating to proposals for residential extensions in the Borough, details of which are not before me. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits I attribute limited weight to these decisions. The absence of any objections from neighbouring residents does not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR