



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2024 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MRTPI MIEMA CEnv

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/24/3342142

30 Allenby Drive, Hornchurch, Havering RM11 3SA

- 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 Bryan Levato against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
- The application Ref P0040.24.
- The development proposed is second floor.

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 Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon (1) the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, and (2) the living conditions of occupants of the neighbouring dwelling at 60 Westland Avenue in respect of outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with multi-hipped roof, located on Allenby Drive at the junction with Westland Avenue. Vehicular access to the site is via a dropped kerb on Westland Avenue. The surrounding area is residential and is characterised by a mixture of single and two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings of various architectural styles, ridge heights and roof scale.
5. The proposed second floor would result in a hipped roof to the side with a jerkinhead style roof to the front. From the evidence before me, the overall height of the dwelling would increase from around 7 metres in height to around 9.8 metres in height. As noted above, there are a variety of roof designs in the area, which include jerkinhead roofs as I observed on my visit to the site. The appellant has also presented pictorial evidence of these as appendices of their Grounds of Appeal. However, while there is a variety of roof designs, properties

on Allenby Drive with similar style roofs are two storeys as opposed to the three storeys in the case of the appeal proposal.

6. Taking the above into consideration, I find that the appeal proposal would result in an excessive increase in height and bulk of the roof. It would appear top heavy and would be an incongruous addition to the street scene in this prominent corner location. The additional storey and roof design would result in the appeal property appearing significantly more dominant than other buildings within the area. The adjacent property at 60 Westland Avenue is of a very similar design and appearance to the appeal property. The proposed development would significantly disrupt this established rhythm and semblance of symmetry due to its increased scale.
7. In coming to this view, I have considered the graphic representation of the proposed corner view¹. However, this only shows the appeal property as proposed, and does not demonstrate how it would relate to other properties in the street scene. The proposed second floor, resulting in a significant increase in the roof scale and bulk, would not be a subservient addition to the host dwelling and would be harmful to its appearance.
8. The appellant highlights how the appeal property is not within a conservation area nor is it a listed building. Whilst this may be the case, the absence of harm to these factors is a neutral factor in the appeal and despite the absence of a heritage designation, this does not overcome the harm I have identified above.
9. I find that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (Adopted November 2021) (the LP) which requires, amongst other things, that development proposals are well designed, of high quality, and respect, reinforce and complement the local street scene. It would also be contrary to the general design principles within the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted March 2011) (the SPD).
10. The development would also be contrary to the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the Framework) that developments are visually attractive, of good architecture and sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Living conditions at 60 Westland Avenue

11. The appeal property is sited broadly in line with the adjoining property, 60 Westland Avenue and is of a similar scale and height. Whilst the appeal property has been extended, so has No. 60 which has a single storey projection which goes beyond the rear wall of the appeal property.
12. Although the proposed development would lead to an inevitable increase in the size and height of the dwelling, I consider that the vertical increase would not be excessive or to such an extent that it would result in an unacceptably restricted outlook from the neighbouring dwelling or its rear garden, and it therefore would not have an overbearing effect. Furthermore, occupants of this

¹ 000_S2/04

property are able to experience the outlook on other sides of the garden above the boundary treatments.

13. I therefore find that the proposed second floor would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the living conditions of the occupants of 60 Westland Avenue with respect to outlook. The development would comply with Policy 7 of the LP, which requires, amongst other things, that developments do not result in an unacceptable outlook.
14. It would also comply with the requirement in the Framework that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for all users.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. While I have found harm would not be caused to the living conditions of the occupants of 60 Westland Avenue with respect to outlook, there would be significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR