The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2024

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:16.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/23/3328454
12 Fairfield Avenue, Upminster, RM14 3AY

- 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 Paul Reilly against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
- The application Ref P1835.22, dated 9 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2023.
- The development is single storey front, side and rear extensions, and reroofing existing roof

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

3. The appeal property lies in a part of the road where the character changes from two storey semi-detached houses to semi-detached bungalows. These are distinctive in their appearance as they see a long, low gable that projects forward from the building. This feature is seen in the adjoining bungalow, and the other pairs of bungalows, which gives a strong and consistent character to the group of properties.

4. The proposed development would see the main roof of the bungalow extended to the side with a simple and modest addition that continues the existing roof form. The front gable would also be extended to the side but in a different fashion: an L shaped roof would create a new short area of pitched roof to the front, with a narrow pitched roof running parallel to the length of the gable. The design of this addition would cut into the existing distinctive gable and relate poorly to the design of the property. This would significantly imbalance the pair of properties, with the development being particularly noticeable in the street scene due to its forward projection and hence long views along Fairfield Avenue.

5. The rear extensions would not have an effect on the character of the area. However, the siting, scale and design of the proposed front extensions would

be intrusive and thus visually disruptive to the existing character of Fairfield Avenue.

6. My attention has been drawn to extensions at other properties. The forward extension at 7 Fairfield Avenue is a notably smaller scale than the appeal scheme that does not disrupt the roof or the overall form of the front gable projection to the degree that is proposed at No. 12. The extensions cited at other properties on Fairfield Avenue are for different types of extensions to that in the current appeal,

7. Other properties in the appellant's submissions relate to different roads. Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2021 states the Council will promote high quality design that, amongst other matters, is informed by the features of a site and the local area, and respects, reinforces and complements the local streetscene. The Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2011 states it is essential that extensions and alterations enhance and protect the positive qualities and characteristics of both individual dwellings as well as the wider streetscape which they form part of. Thus, I find those examples in different parts of the Borough of little relevance to this appeal.

8. It is my conclusion that the proposed development does not satisfy the planning policies referred to above and hence would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR