



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2024

**by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 9<sup>th</sup> April 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/23/3335131**  
**26 Tyle Green, Hornchurch, RM11 2TB**

- 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 Steve Bolton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
  - The application Ref P1420.23, dated 14 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2023.
  - The proposed development is crown roof and internal alterations project.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

2. The Council has described the development as “replacement of roof and loft conversion with rear dormer and roof lights to front” which more accurately describes the proposal.
3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2023, after the date the appeal was lodged. However, the relevant policies have not materially changed therefore I have not sought further comments from the parties.

## Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect on
  - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area; and
  - the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, No. 1 Wakerfield Close.

## Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a detached two-storey dwelling with single and two-storey rear additions, located within a modern residential estate. The surrounding dwellings are predominantly detached though of varying design and appearance. The proposal involves the replacement and enlargement of the existing hipped roof of the property with a ‘crown roof’ which consists of steeply pitched, hipped sides with large central flat-roofed section. The hipped roof over the rear two-storey projection would be replaced with one of slightly greater ridge height and a new flat-roofed dormer would be introduced across about two-thirds of the rear roofslope.

*Character and appearance*

6. The Councils Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2011) (REA SPD) sets out some general design principles including that its main purpose is to ensure that extensions and alterations do not dominate or detract from the character of the original and surrounding houses. It does not refer specifically to crown roofs though does state that roof alterations can change the appearance and character of the dwelling, particularly when made to the front elevation. It also states that dormer windows should, amongst other things, normally be at the rear, so as to not be visible in the street scene, and contained well within the body of the roof, set well back from the eaves and well below the ridge line.
7. The proposed replacement roof would, despite the relatively modest increase in height, result in a significant change in respect of its form and bulk. The additional bulk created as a result of the steeply sloping pitches with large central area of flat 'crown' roof would be considerably greater than the existing hipped roof form. The dwelling occupies a prominent location in the street scene where both its front and side elevations can be readily seen. The change from the modest proportions of the existing lower hipped roof would result in the introduction of a roof shape and bulk that would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene at odds with the majority of the existing hipped and pitched roofs of the surrounding properties, notwithstanding that some have higher ridge heights.
8. The rear dormer would occupy a considerable proportion of the new rear roofslope and would extend almost right up to the top of the roof with only a small gap from the eaves. Whilst it would be sited to the rear, it would add further bulk to the roof which would detract from the host dwelling and its surroundings.
9. The overall effect would be to introduce roof additions of excessive bulk which would detract from host dwelling and be incongruous and visually harmful within the street scene. Overall, there would be conflict with Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (2021) which seeks high quality design that, amongst other things, respects, reinforces and complements the local streetscene and provides attractive living environments for residents. Furthermore, it would fail to satisfy the guidance in the REA SPD.
10. I have had regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as referred to by the Appellant but find that, overall, that the proposed extensions would not accord with its objectives to achieve good design and development that is sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.
11. I have also taken into account the examples of crown roofs within the local area referred to by the Appellant. However, none of these are within the immediate street scene context of the appeal site and none appeared to have a similar position in the street scene as the dwelling on the appeal site. Other appeal decisions referred to which are not within the local area also provide few directly comparable factors; indeed they emphasise that it is the immediate street scene that is most relevant. They therefore provide little justification for the proposal.

*Living conditions*

12. The REA SPD also includes guidance that seeks to avoid overlooking and otherwise consider neighbouring amenity in respect of overshadowing and outlook. The neighbouring property at No. 1 Wakerfield Close lies directly to the west of the appeal site, its rear boundary being the side boundary to the appeal property. The increased bulk of the side element of the roof would therefore be clearly visible from the rear of that property which has a relatively modest rear garden depth and which is sited at a slightly lower level relative to the dwelling on the appeal site.
13. The proposal would result in a much bulkier roof form which as a result of its increased height and steeply sloping pitches and proximity to the common boundary would introduce an oppressive built form that would detract from the outlook of this property.
14. The proposed windows at second floor level would introduce some additional overlooking but given the existing level overlooking / inter-visibility that currently exists between the host dwelling and adjoining properties, this would not be significantly harmful.
15. Overall, however, the proposal would fail to accord with HLP Policy 7 which seeks to ensure that the quality of life of existing and future residents is not adversely affected through, amongst other things, outlook. It would also fail to accord with the aims and objectives of the REA SPD that seek to prevent unacceptable impacts on the amenity of neighbours. It would also fail to comply with the Framework which seeks a high standard of amenity for existing users.

**Conclusions**

16. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

*P B Jarvis*

INSPECTOR