



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2024

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/24/3344426

22-22A Roneo Corner, Hornchurch, Havering RM12 4TN

- 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 Mrs Anju Sharma against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0114.24.
 - The development proposed is the change of roof profile from hip to gable, rear dormer, and front skylights. An external staircase to provide independent access for the upper floor flat and removal of internal staircase from the retail unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end terrace property which is situated in area that contains a mix of retail and commercial uses on the ground floor with residential uses above. The corner location of the appeal property results in it tapering to the rear, such that it has a wider frontage to Roneo Corner than to the rear of the site. The surrounding area exhibits a varied built form, although the generally clear roof planes of terraced properties contribute to a relatively consistent appearance in the streetscene.
4. The proposed dormer would result in a large box like addition at roof level that would extend across most of the width of the roof and be sited close to the eaves with only a short setback. As such, it would be an incongruous addition that would dominate the rear roof slope of the host building. Reference has been made to this type of dormer being common, but there are no such dormers on the terrace that the appeal site forms part of or the neighbouring terrace to the west. Although the dormer would be sited to the rear, the rear of the terrace that the appeal site forms part of is still visible from public vantage points along Grenfell Avenue, from where this aspect of the proposal would appear visually harmful.
5. I therefore conclude that the proposed rear dormer would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the area. As such, it would conflict with Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031, which seek, amongst other matters, high

quality design that respects and compliments the distinctive qualities and character of the site and local area. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which seeks development that is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

6. The appeal site is not subject to any particular protective policy or land use designation and would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. The Council raise no concerns in relation to the external staircase, front rooflights and the change in the roof from hip to a gable form and I have no reason to disagree. These are all however neutral matters, and not ones which weigh in favour of the proposed development.
7. The proposal would provide independent access to a residential flat. However, there are no concerns in relation to this aspect of the proposal which includes an external staircase. In any event, this would not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.

Conclusion

8. I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the development plan as a whole, and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a decision other than in accordance with this. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR