



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/24/3353948

13 Ravenscourt Grove, Hornchurch, Havering, RM12 6HS

- 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 Bogdan Baciú against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0711.24.
 - The development proposed is conversion to include a rear dormer with Juliette balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a conversion to include a rear dormer with Juliette balcony at 13 Ravenscourt Grove, Hornchurch, RM12 6HS in accordance with the terms of the application, ref P0711.24, and the plans submitted numbered A201 1/2, A201 2/2, A208 1/2, A208 2/2, E101, E108 & E102/A202.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The proposal is retrospective in that the development has been carried out.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is located within an area characterised by pairs of two storey semi-detached dwellings with two storey projecting bay windows set under gable roofs a typical feature on the front elevations. Many of the dwellings within the road have been extended or altered. A two-storey care home (Ravenscourt Nursing Home) is situated on the opposite side of a single track which runs parallel to the side boundary of the attached neighbouring dwelling at 11 Ravenscourt Grove. The track provides access to the care home and a residential car park which adjoins the rear garden of the appeal property.
6. The proposed flat roof dormer has already been constructed although I noted at the time of the site visit that the glass balustrade for the Juliette balcony had not yet

been installed. The dormer covers most of the rear roof slope and is clad in a grey colour hanging tile.

7. Due to the overall combined size, form, height and depth of the dormer, it dominates the rear roof slope and appears as a bulky and top heavy form of development. The top of the dormer is set just below the ridge height of the main house roof, and it is only set in slightly from the eaves. This does not adhere to the guidance on the size and positioning of dormer extensions within the roof slope set out within The Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2011) to ensure good design and subserviency of extensions to host dwellings.
8. The window and door frame within the dormer do not align with those of the first floor of the existing dwelling, directly below, although I accept that the window is of a similar proportion. Furthermore, although the type of hanging tile doesn't match that of the main roof, the colour matches and assists with assimilating it into the roof slope and consequently reduces in part the prominence of the dormer.
9. The Council acknowledge in the Officer report that the dormer when viewed from the street scene (Ravenscourt Grove) is largely hidden from view by the front gabled feature of the dwelling as well as the roof of the two storey side extension. I agree with this conclusion, as the dormer is not notably visible from within the street scene and the front elevation of the dwelling remains unchanged therefore, it does not directly affect the character of the local street scene.
10. The dormer is visible in glimpses from the track which runs between the side boundary of no. 11 and the care home, although I observed during my site visit that there are no windows at first floor level on the side elevation of the care home adjoining the track and therefore views of the dormer would be restricted to the ground floor side elevation windows and would be mostly obscured by the mature trees on the boundary of no.11.
11. The visual impact of the dormer when viewed from the residential car park to the rear of the appeal site is diluted by the intervening distance of the long garden for the appeal dwelling and the mature trees on the rear garden boundary which provides a degree of screening. The dormer which is set slightly below the ridge of the main dwelling assimilates into the roof skyline when viewed from this set back position. It does not extend beyond the existing two storey rear gable projection and therefore the visual impact is partially obscured from the rear garden of the neighbouring dwelling at no.15. Nevertheless, I recognise that the dormer is highly visible from the rear garden of the attached neighbouring dwelling at no.11.
12. Whilst during the site visit I did not observe any other dormers from the appeal property's rear garden, I did observe rear flat roof dormer extensions in the vicinity of the appeal site, visible from elsewhere within the street scene. Therefore, despite the identified harm to the appeal property from the development, I am satisfied that the principle of rear dormers is established and that they do not appear out of character for the surrounding area.
13. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal does not fully comply with the SPD, and the design would result in a moderate level of harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling. Therefore, there is conflict with Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan (2021), Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) which seek to deliver high quality and good design that respects the character of the site.

Other Matters

14. Both the Council and appellant have indicated that a Certificate of Lawfulness has been granted at the attached neighbouring property no.11, for a large rear flat roof dormer extension within permitted development tolerances. This is undoubtedly a material consideration to which I have had due regard. Whilst the dormer had not been implemented at the time of my visit, the evidence before me indicates that although not identical, it would be of a directly comparable size and proportion to the dormer extension the subject of this appeal.
15. It is evident that the visual impact of the appeal proposal is no more significant than that of the permitted development rear roof dormer granted at the neighbouring property under the certificate of lawfulness. The appellant has indicated that such a development could also be undertaken at the appeal property, and I find no reason to dispute the probability of this occurring. I find this therefore to be a decisive factor and one to which I attach significant weight in support of the appeal proposal.

Conditions

16. As the development has already taken place, I have not imposed the standard commencement condition. However, for clarity, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the plans has been imposed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. I have concluded that the detailed design of the dormer extension the subject of this appeal results in moderate harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. However, the granting of a Certificate of lawfulness for a directly comparable development on the neighbouring property is a significant material consideration. The ability to implement a similar scheme as permitted development on the appeal property is accepted and the impact of such a scheme would not be materially different to the works that have already been undertaken. I find therefore that this would on balance outweigh the harm which I have found in respect of the detailed design.
18. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR