



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: 9TH April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/23/3333850
74 Collier Row Road, Romford, RM5 2BA

- 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 Mohammed Nazrul Islam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1000.23, dated 19 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2023.
 - The development is part single, part two storey rear/side extension (part retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, construction works relating to front, side and rear extensions were under way with the majority of the external shell completed. An application for a single storey rear extension with overall depth of 6 metres, maximum height of 3.2 metres and eaves height of 3 metres was found to not require prior approval in 2021¹. Permission was granted in 2021 for single storey ground floor front and rear extension and double storey side/rear extension², the rear single storey extension having a depth of 3.5 metres. The extension as built has a depth of about 6 metres and is located right on the boundary with the attached property, No. 76 Collier Row Road.
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 occupiers of No. 76 Collier Row Road.

¹ Council reference: Y0427.20

² Council reference: P1917.20

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located along a main road which contains a mixture of residential and commercial uses. As noted above, works are currently underway in respect of front, side and rear extensions to the property. There is an outbuilding located at the bottom of the garden, in respect of which permission was granted in October 2023, with a reasonable amount of garden space remaining between the two. I would not describe the rear garden as 'spacious' as suggested by the Appellant but note that due to it being an end of terrace with an angled boundary widening out to the rear, it is wider than that of the adjacent property, No. 76.
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 goes on to state that extensions should be subordinate, should respect the original style and detailing of the host property and the materials used should match or complement those used on the original dwelling.
7. With regard to single storey rear extensions, the REA SPD states that the acceptable depth of such extensions will depend on a number of site-specific considerations, but as a general rule terraced dwellings can be extended by up to 3 metres depth from the original rear wall to ensure subordination; any greater depth should be within the 45 degree guideline. The guidance goes on to state that two storey rear extensions should have pitched roofs set at right angles to the main roof and generally finished with a hipped end. They should be set in from the common boundary, avoid overlooking and otherwise consider neighbouring amenity in respect of overshadowing and outlook.
8. The original dwelling on the appeal site is modest in size with the remaining properties in the terrace of similar proportions. Extensions of modest depth were visible at the rear of adjoining dwellings including the attached property at No. 76, though deeper extensions have been undertaken at Nos. 88 and 90 Collier Row Road.
9. The single storey rear element for which permission is sought extends across the whole width of the site and to a depth that is similar to that of the host dwelling. Whilst the proposed side and rear two storey elements would be of subservient height, when taken together with the substantial single storey rear element, they would add disproportionately in terms of overall scale and mass compared to the host dwelling and therefore, overall, do not comprise subservient additions.
10. I find that cumulatively the extensions detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. This conflicts with Policies 7 and 26 of the Haringey Local Plan 2016-2031 (2021) (HLP) which seeks high quality design that, amongst other things, respects, reinforces and complements the local streetscene and provides attractive living environments for residents. It would also conflict with Policy D4 of The London Plan to which I have been referred and which takes a similar approach. Furthermore, it would fail to satisfy the guidance in the REA SPD.

11. I have had regard to the Framework as referred to by the Appellant but find that, overall, the extensions would not accord with its objectives to achieve good design and development that is sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Living conditions

12. As noted above, the single storey element of the extension is located right on the boundary with No. 76 and has a depth considerably in excess of the rear extension at that property. This would introduce a very deep, high parapet wall right on the boundary with this property. Whilst at the time of the site visit I was not able to gain access to this adjoining property, I could see from the appeal site that the effect of this was to significantly enclose the area to the rear of the property, the flank wall of the extension being an overbearing feature that results in a significant loss of outlook. This effect is exacerbated by the narrow width of this property's garden.
13. With regard to the effect on the other neighbouring property, No. 72, whilst the very long flank elevation of the extension would directly abut the common boundary, the relative siting of the dwellings would ensure that no significantly harmful impact would arise.
14. Overall, therefore, in this respect, 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, loss of privacy, daylight / sunlight or outlook. It would also fail to accord with the aims and objectives of the REA SPD and the Framework.

Other Matters

15. The Appellant argues that the scheme for which permission is now being sought is effectively a combination of the two developments for which 'approval' already exists as referred to above. However, from the information provided, the works that are currently underway on site accord with neither the prior approval application nor the planning permission granted in 2021. The Appellant acknowledges the Council's points regarding the inaccuracy of the 'approved plans' submitted to support this scheme but suggests that the two individual applications should nevertheless be taken into account as a material consideration. Whilst I agree that they are material considerations, in the above circumstances, they are of limited weight.
16. I acknowledge that the proposal would enable an enhanced level of accommodation for the Appellant and his family; however, this factor does not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusions

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

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR