



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 April 2025

by John Felgate BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/24/3354096

275 Rainham Road, Rainham, Essex RM13 7SH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and paragraph AA.2(3)(a) of Schedule 2, Part 1, of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mrs J Begum against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is J0020.24.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension consisting of four bedrooms and a bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval is granted, under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), for the development described above at 275 Rainham Road, Rainham, Essex RM13 7SH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref J0020.24, and the submitted plans numbered 2076/03, 2076/04 and 2076/05.

Reasons

2. Class AA of the above Order provides that the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by the construction of an additional storey is permitted development, subject to compliance with various conditions and exclusions, and subject to prior approval in respect of certain specified matters. In the present case, there is no apparent dispute that the proposed development falls within the scope of Class AA, and is not precluded by any of the provisions of paragraph AA.1. Having regard to the submissions before me, the relevant matters for prior approval are the effects on the external appearance of the building, and on the amenity of any adjoining premises.
3. The appeal property is an L-shaped bungalow, comprising a main front section and a smaller rear wing. The proposed scheme would add an additional storey above the main, front part of the building. The new first floor walls would rise directly above those of the ground floor, and their height would be the same. The new windows in the front elevation would be positioned in line with the existing ones below, and would reflect their size and style; the ground floor bay feature would not be repeated, but this seems to me a sensible omission. The new roof would replicate the pitch and profile of the existing structure; and whilst the roof shape is somewhat unusual, with an asymmetrical change of slope, this seems to me an attractive feature, and therefore one which would not be harmful, even with the greater prominence that it would assume due to the increase in the building's

overall height. The submitted plans also specify that the brickwork and tiles are to match those existing. In all these respects, the proposed scheme would seem to me to result in a well-proportioned and well-mannered design.

4. The resulting building would be a full storey taller than either of its immediate neighbours. However, I saw on my visit that this part of Rainham Road contains a wide mixture of differing building heights. On the western side, Nos 279 and 281, just two doors along from the appeal site, are a pair of 2-storey semi-detached houses. Beyond this, the next property is a bungalow, but then comes a large 3-storey house, and then a 2-storey block of flats, followed by a long row of further 2-storey houses. In the other direction, Nos 251 – 269 are predominantly single-storey, but Nos 259 and 265 have had their roofs enlarged and dormer windows added, creating a varied roof line. On the opposite side of the street, the development comprises 2-storey terraced housing and 3-storey flats. All in all therefore, the street scene is varied. Seen in this context, the development now proposed would be well within the existing range of heights. Consequently, to my mind, it would not appear noticeably different from its neighbours, but rather would blend into the surroundings. As such, the scheme would have no adverse effects on the appearance of either the appeal property itself or the area in general.
5. At the rear, the new first floor accommodation would face towards an area of former garden land that has now been fenced off and appears disused, behind Nos 275 itself and No 269 Rainham Road. From the information before me, it appears that a planning application has been submitted for a dwelling on this land, but not yet determined; however, I have no details of this scheme. As far as I am aware, the site does not benefit from any planning permission at this stage. The development at the appeal property would be clearly visible from this adjoining land, and its two rear bedroom windows would look in that direction. But the distance from the boundary would be sufficient to provide a reasonable amount of separation. Irrespective of any effects on the current, undetermined application, there is no evidence to suggest that the development now proposed would make it impossible to develop the land at the rear without unacceptable levels of overlooking or visual intrusion. Furthermore, no windows are proposed in the side elevations, and there is no suggestion that any other adjoining property would be unduly affected in any way.
6. Having regard to all the above matters, I find that the effects of the appeal proposal on the appearance of the building and its surroundings, and on the amenity of adjoining properties, would be acceptable.

Conclusion and conditions

7. For these reasons, I conclude that prior approval should be granted.
8. This approval is subject to the statutory conditions set out in paragraphs AA.2(2) and (3) of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Order. These include a requirement for the Council to be notified of both the commencement and completion of the development, a 3-year time limit for completion, starting from the date of this decision, and that the property be used only as a dwellinghouse within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended).

J Felgate

INSPECTOR