



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2024

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/24/3352521
175 Hornchurch Road, Hornchurch, RM12 4TE

- 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 Sharmin Jahan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0830.24, dated 11 June 2024, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2024.
 - The proposed development is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers of 173 Hornchurch Road.
3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house, which has been extended to the rear with a single storey extension that sits on the boundary with the attached neighbour of No. 173. The proposal would see a further extension, to a total depth of 6m from the original house. The height of the extension would be 3.3m.
4. The adjoining house of No. 173 has not been extended. I viewed the appeal site from that property's garden and from within the house. It was clear to me that due to the depth and height of the proposed extension, sitting directly on the boundary, there would be a very dominant effect on the outlook from No. 173. There would be a significant overbearing impact to that property's garden and from within the house too. These matters would give rise to significant visual intrusion.
5. From my observations at the site visit, I also consider the height, depth and proximity to the rear window is also likely to affect levels of light to the rear room of No. 173.
6. The scale of the extension would therefore materially harm the living conditions of occupants. This would conflict with the relevant policies of the Havering Local Plan 2021, namely Policies 7 and 26 which, amongst other matters, resist development that causes unacceptable harm to residential amenity. The proposal is also contrary to similar objectives as set out in the Residential

Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2011. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR