



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2024

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/23/3333348

37 Ashmour Gardens, Havering, Romford RM1 4RR

- 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 Dangel Begu against the decision of the London Borough of Havering Council.
 - The application Ref P1136.23, dated 19 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'full width dormer extension to the pre-approved application ref: p2010.22 with hip to gable roof change on the main roof, additional 2x velux rooflights at the front pitch, 2x velux rooflights at the back pitch and additional 2x Juliette balcony'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. These are the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached properties and on the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows and has an extensive planning history. The original building was substantially demolished in 2022 and planning permission was later granted for a replacement semi-detached bungalow, with 'permitted development rights' removed. These building works are well underway. The appeal proposal is for amendments to the approved scheme and follows an earlier, similar scheme which was refused planning permission.
4. In my judgement, the cumulative impact of the hip to gable extension and the large rear dormer would amount to an overbearing and bulky development that would harm the appearance of the host property and the pair of semis. It is stated that the adjoining semi-detached property has been extended at roof level without consent. Notwithstanding this, whilst the design and appearance of the two bungalows differ due to various other alterations that have been made, their hipped roofs retain an element of cohesiveness between the pair on a prominent corner site. The appeal proposal would result in its loss.
5. The appeal site is in a predominantly residential area containing properties of a range of styles, sizes and materials, some of which have been extended,

including at roof level. Nonetheless, the proposal would result in an incongruous addition to the dwelling as the surrounding context comprises predominantly hipped roof properties. The high level of visibility of this corner site from adjacent roads would further emphasise its harmful, bulky appearance.

6. The appellant states that the proposed works to the roof could have been carried out on the original dwelling under permitted development rights. However, the appeal proposal relates to a replacement dwelling without permitted development rights and therefore requires planning permission. Whilst other properties in the surrounding area have carried out roof level alterations, none share the same design or built context of the appeal property. Accordingly, this appeal proposal has been determined on its individual merits. Furthermore, the appellant's examples of local developments carried out lawfully are not a good reason to permit development that I have concluded would further harm local character.
7. Notwithstanding the proposed use of high-quality materials, I conclude that the bulk and mass of the proposed rear dormer window along with the hip to gable roof extension would harm the appearance of the host property and the pair of semi-detached houses when they are viewed together. The proposal would amount to a dominant and visually intrusive development which would also harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. For these reasons, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 7 (Residential design and amenity) and 26 (Urban Design) of the Havering Local Plan which, in summary and of relevance to this appeal, require high quality design which is informed by its surroundings. There would also be conflict with the detailed design requirements of Section 8 of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document relating to rear dormers.
8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR