



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2024

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th August 2024p

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/24/3342046

21 Glanville Drive, Hornchurch, RM11 3SY.

- 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 Dimitris Themistocli against the decision of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P1890.23.
 - The development proposed is described as *loft conversion on the detached bungalow*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I note that the Council has previously refused an earlier application for a certificate of lawfulness for a similar development to that now proposed and the appellant considers the basis of that decision was unsound. However, that matter is not before me at appeal.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the existing dwelling, and thereby the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 21 Granville Gardens (No 21) is a detached bungalow. It is the last bungalow in a row of three similar double fronted bungalows. However, unlike the other two No 21 has a steeper gabled roof.
5. The street is characterised by a mix of residential properties, mainly semi-detached two-storey houses.
6. The appellant proposes the enlargement of the existing loft space accommodation, including, amongst other alterations, the construction of two large flat roofed box dormers, one to either side of the roof. The flat roof of the dormers would be set at about the same height as the ridge line of the existing bungalow. The dormers would extend out virtually to the eaves line of the property.

7. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted 2011) (SPD), advises that dormers should be contained well within the body of the roof by setting the sides well in from any gables or party walls, the eaves, and located well below the ridge line of the roof. Further window in those dormers should relate well in proportion, design and position to those of the original dwelling.
8. The two dormers would be set well in from the gable ends of the existing roof and, as both would be equal in size, when viewed from the front and rear of the property they would appear balanced, one with another. However, in this case given their size, design and position on the roof the proposed dormers would not accord with the advice given in the SPD. In particular, they would not be well contained within the body of the roof. In addition, due to the height and position of the windows, particularly those facing No 23 they would not align or relate well to the retained ground floor windows.
9. Accordingly, the proposed dormers would be so obtrusive as to dominate the existing roof and appear incongruous in the context of the existing modest bungalow. As a result, they would be materially harmful to the architectural integrity of the existing dwelling.
10. The appearance of the north-east facing dormer would be less prominent when viewed from the public realm by reason of the neighbouring house. Nevertheless, the development as designed would cause significant harm to character and appearance of the surrounding area.
11. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the objectives of Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (Adopted 2021) (LP), the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Council's SPD as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of architectural design, and the requirement to respect, reinforce and complement the local street scene.

Other Matters

12. In reaching my determination I have been mindful of the appellant's need for additional accommodation due to his growing family and a requirement for a study/office to enable home working. I also note that the existing access to the loft space may not meet current Building Regulations. However, given the harm that I have identified these considerations alone do not outweigh that harm.
13. The appellant has referred me to several flat roofed box dormers set on to the side roofs of some local dwellings, including a pair of dormers one to either side of the roof of a bungalow Mardon, in Maywin Drive. Dormers are clearly not an alien feature locally. Nevertheless, and whatever the background to those cases, their existence is not an appropriate justification for permitting proposed development here which I have considered on its individual planning merits.
14. The appeal site is not within a conservation area or an area of special local character neither is the property either locally or statutorily listed. However, an overriding consideration of both the LP and the Framework is high quality design. Based on the scheme design before me I am not persuaded that the proposal is of design quality required.
15. I note that the development would be built using matching materials, which would be appropriate here. However, the absence of harm is a neutral factor in

my considerations and, as such, I have given this consideration very limited weight in my decision.

16. The appellant has suggested that under permitted development rights he would be able to construct dormers of a similar size and scale to those proposed. However, from the Council's evidence I note that the roof of this bungalow has previously been altered. As no drawings or other supporting evidence has been submitted by the appellant to demonstrate that such a scheme would in fact fall to be considered within Class B of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2015. Accordingly, I can give this consideration no weight in the consideration of this appeal.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR