



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2025

by **L Gardner MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/24/3352649

300A Brentwood Road, Romford, Havering RM2 5TA

- 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 Ms Claire O'Grady against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application ref is P0990.24.
 - The development proposed is removal of double garage, to allow the formation of a single storey side extension with room in roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site sits within a predominantly residential area, albeit there are interspersed commercial uses including adjacent to and opposite the site. There are a variety of building types, heights and materials in the immediately surrounding area. Roof types in particular vary between hipped and pitched roofs, with the adjacent commercial use featuring a two-storey parapet flat roof.
4. The proposal would introduce a pitched roof to the building which as existing is served by a hipped roof (notwithstanding the single storey flat roof on the garage proposed for demolition). The maximum height of the roof would be almost as high as the eaves of the host building, introducing a significantly disproportionate roof slope into the street scene when compared to the host building. The result of this is that the roof of the extension would appear top heavy and bulky in the context of the host building and fail to assimilate well with it. I therefore disagree with the appellant's statement that the design overall would show a matching appearance to the host property.
5. The appellant contends that the proposed design would be more favourable than other roof forms, including a flat roof. However, no further information has been submitted to substantiate or evidence this claim and so I have given this point very little weight in my decision. I have assessed the proposal based on the plans before me and concluded that the contrasting roof style between the extension and the host building would have a materially harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host building and consequently to the wider area.

6. Policy D4 of the London Plan (LP) relates generally to ensuring that development delivers a high quality. This is mirrored by Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan (HLP) (2021) which both require a high design quality that, amongst other matters, respects and complements the features of the site and character of the local area. The proposal fails to achieve the design aspirations set out within these policies and is therefore contrary to Policy D4 of the LP and Policies 7 and 26 of the HLP.

Other Matters

7. Within the appellant's statement, photographs have been provided of extensions at Hazelmere Gardens and Brentwood Road. I do not have the full details of these extensions, including their wider site context or status in relation to planning permission. Nevertheless, none of the examples given are directly comparable to the design of the appeal proposal before me and therefore I have given these examples very little weight in my decision.
8. A lack of objection to the proposal, or indeed a lack of harm in relation to living conditions of neighbouring properties does not outweigh the harm I have identified in respect to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area. I also note that the site is not within a designated conservation area, but this does not diminish the importance of ensuring that development delivers a high design quality as required by Policies 7 and 26 of the HLP and Policy D4 of the LP.
9. I acknowledge the appellant's concerns over the Council's handling of the application. However, this is not a matter that I can consider under a Section 78 planning appeal and does not alter my findings, in which I have had regard solely to the planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan when read as a whole and all relevant materials considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Gardner

INSPECTOR