



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2024 by M Long BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/24/3338192

14 Fernden Way, Romford RM7 9PJ

- 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 S Khaled against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P1521.23.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side and part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey, semi-detached property which forms a semi-detached pair with 13 Fernden Way (No 13). They are located in a prominent central position at the end of this cul-de-sac. These dwellings have shared characteristics with the other semi-detached pairs and short terraces on Fernden Way, most notably in terms of the comparable widths of their original facades, their front projecting bays and their hipped main roofs. There are some extensions and alterations to dwellings in the locality, which do not reinforce the characteristics of their host. Indeed, No 13 has a two-storey, flat roofed side extension which to some extent reduces the symmetry of the pair. Even so, there remains an overriding consistency and traditional character to the built form on this street.
5. Despite its set back from the front elevation, the alignment of its eaves and windows with those on the host dwelling and the use of matching materials, the extension's flat roofed form would jar with the pitched roof form of its host. Any balancing effect on the semi-detached pair would be undermined by the side extension's contrasting angled shape, and its more substantial width when compared with the side projection of the neighbouring extension at No 13. Given the prominent position of the pair, this would be notable in views from the street. There would also be conflict with the Havering Residential

Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011) which states that, as side extensions are highly visible from the street, it is important that their design reflects the original house in terms of roof style.

6. Furthermore, to the rear, the considerable width and flat roofed design of the extension would appear as a substantial and bulky mass that would largely consume and compete with the original form of the host dwelling. While there are a variety of extension designs in this area, I did not observe that similar bulky first-floor rear extensions of this scale were a common characteristic of the locality.
7. Even though, the rear element of the proposal would not be visible from the street, it would be very noticeable from a number of neighbouring windows and gardens. In any event, I do not consider that any lack of public visibility obviates the need to achieve good design in this instance. Indeed, paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that the creation of high-quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.
8. Overall, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (2021) which together, amongst other things, seek development proposals that are of a high architectural quality and design and which respect, reinforce and complement the local street scene.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR