



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2024

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/24/3337278 29 Percy Road, Romford RM7 8QX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tariq Din against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0767.23.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear infill extension at 29 Percy Road, Romford RM7 8QX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0767.23, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Plans and Elevations, Drawing Number PropPla/29percyrd/001.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's Decision Notice as this is more precise.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on 1) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and 2) the living conditions of the occupants of no. 31 Percy Road with regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. It is located in a predominantly residential area where many of the surrounding properties have been extended. There is a track to the side of the property that provides access to the rear of surrounding properties.

5. The property has an existing single storey rear extension which projects 6 metres from the rear elevation and runs along the boundary with no. 31 Percy Road. The evidence shows that this extension was approved¹ under the prior approval for permitted development procedure.
6. The appeal development therefore relates to an 'infill' area between the existing rear extension and the side of the property.
7. Although the extension would be visible from the rear, with only glimpsed views from the street-scene being possible along the access track, it would be of a consistent style and materials with the existing extension. It would also be seen in an environment where several of the surrounding properties have been extended at the rear, including single storey flat roof extensions.
8. Due to its overall design, size and siting, when taken with the existing extensions, it would not appear dominant or visually prominent.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed infill extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would comply with Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan (2021) which requires that development is of high-quality design which respects, reinforces and complements the local street-scene having regard to the local identity and character.
10. The development would also comply with the general design principles of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011) insofar that careful consideration should be given to the effect of the development on the character of the original house and the wider street scene.

Living conditions

11. The Council refers to the harmful impact they consider would be caused to the living conditions on the occupants of no. 31 Percy Road with regard to outlook and light.
12. The evidence shows that the extension on the common boundary with no. 31 is separate from the appeal development and was granted prior approval as part of a separate application. Although cumulative impacts can be pertinent, the development subject to the appeal is located some distance from the adjoining property and is set further back than the existing extension.
13. The infill extension may be visible from the first floor of the neighbours, however given its overall size and context, the impact on outlook is negligible. Given the presence of the existing extension, there would be no impact on levels of light to no. 31 as a result.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposed infill extension would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupants of no. 31 Percy Road with regard to outlook and light. It would comply with Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan (2021) which requires, amongst other things, that developments should protect the amenity of residents, including having regard to outlook and light.

¹ Application Reference Y0026.19

Other Matters

15. I have been referred to a previous appeal decision² where an Inspector found that a proposed extension to the property would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It is clear, however, that the development in that case related to a different extension which included a two-storey side and rear extension. The Inspector found that the harm was caused in relation to the scale of the development, a factor which is significantly different in the appeal proposal, and something which I do not find harm with in this case.

Conditions

16. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.
17. It is also necessary to impose a planning condition requiring the use of external materials to match those used in the host property. This is in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
18. The Council's suggested conditions refer to 'SC48 Balcony condition'. There is however no description or reason as to why such a condition would be necessary. The proposed development does not include a balcony. I have therefore not imposed the condition.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR

² APP/B5480/D/20/3251235