
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 4 April 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/B5480/W/24/3356000

1, 3, 5 Tweed Way, Romford RM1 4AZ and 368, 370, 372, 374 Havering Road, Romford RM1 4FE

- 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 Pellumb Mazreku against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0778.24.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension at 1 Tweed Way, Romford RM1 4AZ, 3 Tweed Way, Romford RM1 4AZ, 5 Tweed Way, Romford RM1 4AZ and 368 Havering Road, Romford RM1 4FE, 370 Havering Road, Romford RM1 4FE, 372 Havering Road, Romford RM1 4FE, 374 Havering Road, Romford RM1 4FE
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/B5480/W/24/3356001

1, 3, 5 Tweed Way, Romford RM1 4AZ and 368, 370, 372, 374 Havering Road, Romford RM1 4FE

- 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 Pellumb Mazreku against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0764.24.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with rear and side dormers and front skylights at 1 Tweed Way, Romford RM1 4AZ, 3 Tweed Way, Romford RM1 4AZ, 5 Tweed Way, Romford RM1 4AZ and 368 Havering Road, Romford RM1 4FE, 370 Havering Road, Romford RM1 4FE, 372 Havering Road, Romford RM1 4FE, 374 Havering Road, Romford RM1 4FE
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/B5480/W/24/3356000

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B Ref: APP/B5480/W/24/3356001

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Background

3. Both appeals relate to a recently completed housing scheme of 7 dwellings that are similar in scale and design that I shall refer to hereafter as 'the development'. These dwellings are arranged in 2 'back-to-back' rows with a detached house and a semi-detached pair facing Tweed Way (Nos 1, 3 and 5) and 2 semi-detached pairs addressing Havering Road (Nos 368, 370, 372 and 374).

4. In Appeal A, planning permission is sought for a single storey extension to the rear of each dwelling together alterations to the layout of the plots. In Appeal B, dormer extensions are proposed on the side and rear slopes of each dwelling with roof lights to be inserted at the front. Although there are 2 separate appeals before me to determine, a main issue is common to both proposals. To avoid duplication, I shall, therefore, deal with the appeals together except where otherwise indicated.

Procedural matters

5. According to the Council, the dwellings within the development have not been constructed in accordance with the approved details nor do the submitted plans in each appeal accurately reflect the development, as built. I note that an application has been made that seeks retrospective planning permission for the development, as constructed, the full details of which are not before me. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed each appeal in the light of the plans that were considered by the Council and are before me because it was on that basis that planning permission was withheld.
6. The appellant has requested that Appeal A be determined with consideration given to 3 additional plans, which show a wider back garden to No 368 compared to the scheme that was refused planning permission. The rear garden of No 370 is also narrower as a result. No other changes to the development are sought. On that basis and given that the Council has had the opportunity to comment on these plans through the appeal process, I am satisfied that no injustice would be caused if I were to consider them. I shall therefore deal with Appeal A based on the plans provided at both the application and appeal stages.
7. On 12 December 2024, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework 2024) was published with an amendment issued on 7 February 2025. The Framework 2024, as amended, does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of these appeals.

Main issues

8. A main issue common to both appeals is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. An additional issue raised in Appeal A is whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupiers of No 368 with particular regard to outlook and sense of enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

9. The development is within a predominantly residential area wherein dwellings vary in size, style and general appearance. I saw that several properties within the area surrounding the site had been extended and externally altered at the rear. Consequently, there is some variety to the existing built form in the locality.
10. A consequence of introducing a full-width ground floor extension to each dwelling, as proposed in Appeal A, is that the depth and size of the back garden within each plot would be reduced. The proposal would also elongate the built form of each dwelling, enlarge its footprint and add to its scale and mass. With each dwelling being notably larger and served by a noticeably smaller back garden, the main

effect of the proposal in Appeal A would be to significantly reduce the space perceived to be around the rears and sides of the buildings within the development.

11. When seen from the rear windows of the dwellings within the development and their back gardens, the proposal would draw the eye as an unusually intense form of development in an area where other existing properties seem to occupy more spacious plots. In that context, the development in Appeal A would be perceived as an overdevelopment of the site and cramped in terms of layout.
12. In Appeal B, roof level extensions and roof lights are sought to each dwelling, with a new dormer to be introduced to the rear and at one side apart from No 1, where 3 dormers are proposed. Each new dormer would be modest in scale and set in from the edges of the host roof, broadly in line with the advice contained within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Extensions and Alterations*. As roof level extensions and dormers are a feature of several properties in the area to which the site belongs, the extensions proposed in Appeal B would not, in principle, be an uncharacteristic addition.
13. However, multiple dormers are sought that together would significantly add to the scale and mass of each building at a high level and fundamentally alter its distinctive hipped roof form. With each new dormer also occupying a prominent elevated position, these extensions would be highly conspicuous and repetitive features, that would be evident from the rears of the dwellings and, in part, along short sections of Tweed Way and Havering Road. In these views, the dwellings would draw the eye given their awkward top-heavy appearance due to the scale and bulk of the new dormers and the altered roof form.
14. In reaching these conclusions, I note that the external materials in both appeals would match those of the existing dwelling. I also note that the site is not within a conservation area nor within the setting of a listed building.
15. On the first main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed development in each appeal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. Accordingly, the proposals conflict with Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (LP). These policies promote high quality design and support development that, amongst other things, respects, reinforces and complements the distinctive qualities of the site and the local area.

Living conditions of the occupiers of No 368

16. In Appeal A, the space left around No 368 within its plot with the additional built form in place would be modest with private amenity space limited to a small irregular shaped parcel at the back of the dwelling. Although small, this outdoor area would remain suitable for a range of day-to-day activities including sitting out, drying clothes and as a play space for small children. Direct access to this garden would be from the lounge and externally from a path alongside the dwelling.
17. The back garden of No 368 would be small and largely enclosed. Nevertheless, I am persuaded that the outlook towards and from within this outdoor space would be reasonable and that existing and future occupiers would not feel an undue sense of enclosure if the development in Appeal A were to proceed. On that basis, I conclude on the second main issue that the proposed development in Appeal A would provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupiers of No 368.

18. Accordingly, the proposal does not conflict with Policy D6 of The London Plan or LP Policy 7 insofar as they aim to ensure that the amenity and quality of life of residents are not adversely affected. It also complies with the Framework 2024, which states that developments should create places that achieve a high standard of amenity for all users. My favourable finding on this matter does not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the first main issue.

Other matters

19. Once complete, the living space created in both appeals would provide valuable additional accommodation that would benefit existing and future occupiers. However, this consideration does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified in relation to the first main issue.
20. Interested parties raise several additional objections to the appeal schemes including the future occupancy of each dwelling, light, vehicle parking, highway safety and potential noise and general disturbance. These are important matters, and I have considered all the submitted evidence. However, given my findings on the first main issue, these considerations have not been critical to my decisions.

Conclusion

21. The proposed development in each appeal would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decisions should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
22. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that each appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR