



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2024 by I Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA CEnv MRTPI

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/24/3343544

White Lodge, Main Road, Romford RM2 6NR

- 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. Sayyid Farooq against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0067.24.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a part single, part two storey rear extension at White Lodge, Main Road, Romford, RM2 6NR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0067.24, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 19/024/001 A and 19/024/003.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows/dormer windows [other than those expressly authorised by this permission] shall be constructed on the flank walls of the extensions hereby permitted, unless specific permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has first been sought and obtained in writing from the local planning authority.
 - 5) The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the local planning authority.
 - 6) The non-opening patio window on the flank wall of the extension hereby permitted shall be fitted with obscure glazing and this shall be retained as such at all times.

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 Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon 1) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and 2) the living conditions of occupants of 9 and 11 Farnes Road with regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a large two-storey detached property located on Main Road in Romford. It is set within a deep and generous linear plot which is accessed from Main Road and stretches to Gillian Crescent at the rear. The site is bounded at the sides by the rear gardens of properties on Farnes Drive and Oxley Close. While the surrounding area is predominantly characterised by two-storey semi-detached properties, the appeal site and property depart from this arrangement and are distinct in size, design and depth. The proposed extension would not be readily visible from Main Road. However, the rear of the property can be viewed on Gillian Crescent.
5. The appeal property currently has a two-storey rear extension, a rear dormer, and a single storey conservatory at the rear. The evidence before me suggests that planning permission has been granted for a single storey rear extension¹ with a depth of 4 metres. London Borough of Havering's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document Adopted 2011 (the SPD) states that, as a general rule, houses can be extended from the rear wall of the original dwelling by up to 4 metres in depth for a detached dwelling². The SPD also outlines that two storey rear extensions should be set in from the common boundary with any attached dwelling by not less than 2 metres and should project no more than 3 metres.
6. Although the single storey element projects 4.03 metres, the difference from the distance as set out in the SPD is *de minimus*. The Council set out that this is the same as the previously approved application. The first-floor element would also project no more than 3 metres from the rear of the dwelling and would be more than 2 metres from the common boundary. This would comply with the SPD guidance.
7. The appeal property is a distinctive and perceptible feature on the street scene of Gillian Crescent on account of its size and design. I find that the scale and massing of the proposed extension would not result in a significant increase in dominance over and above the existing dwelling, to such a degree where it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or surrounding area. The design of the extension in terms of its fenestration, materials and general form, would be in keeping with that of the host property.
8. Consequently, the proposal would comply with the objectives of Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016 – 2031 Adopted November 2021 (the LP). This,

¹ P1427.23

² Paragraph 5.3

among other matters seeks to ensure that proposals are informed by, respect and complement the distinctive qualities, identity, character and geographical features of the site and surrounding area.

Living conditions

9. The appeal proposal would be most visible from the rear of 9 and 11 Farnes Road. The SPD states that the depth of any proposed rear extension will depend on a number of site-specific considerations. This includes amongst others the proximity to neighbouring dwellings.
10. The submitted plans show, as well as my observations upon my visit to the site, that the proposed extension would still be reasonably set back from the common boundary with the rear gardens of these properties, more than the 2 metres referred to in the SPD. Furthermore, the rear gardens are relatively deep such that the rear outer wall of these properties are a reasonable distance from the boundary, and views are slightly obstructed by vegetation as well as outbuildings at the rearmost part of the gardens.
11. Based on the separation distance and its overall size and siting, the proposed part single, part two storey rear extension would not be significantly overbearing to occupants of these properties. I also note that there is an existing two-storey rear extension to the property, which is of a similar arrangement with the rear of the properties on Oxley Close as would be between the proposed extension and the rear of the properties on Farnes Drive.
12. Thus, I find that the proposed part single, part two storey rear extension would not cause harm to the living conditions of occupants of 9 and 11 Farnes Road with regard to outlook. Consequently, it would not conflict with the objectives of Policy 7 of the LP. This, amongst other matters seek to ensure that developments do not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge concerns raised by neighbouring residents, some of which have been addressed in consideration of the main issues above.
14. With regard to overdevelopment of the site, this would not result from the proposed extension as there is adequate separation on all sides within this generous plot. Furthermore, suggested future uses as a Home of Multiple Occupation (HMO) or Bed and Breakfast (B&B) have limited weight, as the application can only be considered on the proposal before me. As such, any anticipated increased noise and parking strain would also not apply to the appeal proposal which is to extend an existing dwelling. There is no substantive evidence that parking demand or noise would unacceptably increase as a result of the development. Similarly, there is no substantive evidence that there would be an unacceptable loss of light and I find that given the overall scale and siting of the development, including the orientation of the appeal property and surrounding properties, this would not be unacceptable.
15. I acknowledge the planning history as set out. The previous applications do not, however, alter my findings on the appeal proposal which I have determined on its own individual planning merits.

16. I also note concerns regarding the legibility of the submitted plans. Like the Council, the plans are sufficient for me to determine the appeal. This would therefore not be a reason to dismiss the appeal.

Conditions

17. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans for the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out as approved. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
18. In the interests of the living conditions of occupants of surrounding residential properties, I have also included conditions which require specific permission under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to be sought before any window or other opening (other than those shown on the submitted and approved plans) is formed in the flank wall of the building hereby permitted, and that the roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.
19. Also in the interests of the living conditions of occupants of surrounding properties in relation to ensuring satisfactory levels of privacy, I have imposed a condition requiring that the flank patio window should be obscure glazed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

I Chukwujekwu

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR