



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2024

by A James BSc (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/23/3329419

1 Suffolk Way, Hornchurch, Havering RM11 3ET

- 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 Mugagga Charles Lwanga against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0804.23, dated 22 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2023.
 - The development is described as 'proposed two storey infill side extension, single storey rear extension, loft conversion with one rear dormer window and three front roof lights, front porch roof extended across the front elevation, and associated works of making good.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the Council issued its decision notice, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been revised, with the latest version published on 19 December and updated on 20 December 2023. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal remain broadly the same. As a result, I have not sought further submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party has been prejudiced by my approach.
3. The appellant advises that some of the plans that were subject to consideration by the Council were not listed on the decision notice and others were referenced with the incorrect revision number. Both main parties have submitted copies of the same plans, which have identical revision numbers and include those that the appellant claims were omitted from the decision notice. As a result, I have determined the appeal based on the plans before me.

Main Issue

4. The reason for refusal relates solely to the proposed side extension. As a result, the main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies within a residential area, which is predominantly characterised by two storey semi-detached and detached dwellings. The dwellings in the area typically have traditional pitched roofs and a consistent eaves height.

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling, which occupies a prominent corner plot. The existing property has a two storey side projection. The front elevation of the existing two storey side projection is broadly in line with the existing front building line; however, it does not extend as far rearwards as the principal part of the dwelling. The existing two storey side projection has the same roof pitch, eaves height and uses the same materials as the host property. Its ridge height is lower than the ridge of the host property. As a result of the above, the existing two storey side projection appears subservient in relation to, and integrates well with the host property.
7. The proposed two storey side extension would be wider and have a higher ridge and eaves height than the existing side projection. The increase in eaves height would disrupt the symmetry on this pair of semi-detached properties and would fail to respect the consistent eaves height seen on the host property and typically seen on neighbouring properties. Consequently, the proposal would appear as an incongruous addition to the host property, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of this pair of semi-detached properties and the area.
8. The ridge height of the proposed two storey extension would only be slightly lower than the main ridge on the existing dwelling. While the first floor part of the proposed extension would be set back approximately 1 metre from the existing front building line, the proposal by reason of its higher eaves height and only slightly lower ridge height would fail to appear subordinate in relation to the host dwelling.
9. I acknowledge that space would be retained adjacent to the side boundary, which would ensure that the proposed side extension would not appear cramped in relation to its plot. Furthermore, the proposed external materials would match the existing. Nevertheless, this would not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
10. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposal would conflict with Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016 – 2031, adopted November 2021. These policies among other things require that new residential development is of high quality design and that new development respects, reinforces and complements the local street scene. The proposal would also conflict with the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2011, which among other things requires that side extensions are subordinate to the existing dwelling and do not unbalance a pair of semi-detached properties.

Other Matters

11. During the course of the planning application process, the appellant tried to address the concerns of the Council by submitting amended plans. I appreciate the frustration of the appellant that these plans were deemed unacceptable. Nevertheless, for the reasons set out above, I agree that the proposal would cause an unacceptable level of harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework that would outweigh this conflict. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A James

INSPECTOR