

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 May 2025

by **Alexander O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 May 2025

---

### Appeal Ref: 6000067

#### 40 Princes Road, Romford RM1 2SP

- 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 Nadim Naqavi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
  - The application Ref is P0993.24.
  - The development proposed is described on the application form as, "First Floor & Second Floor Side Extension Inc Rear Dormer".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. Differing to the description of development in the banner heading above, the Council's decision notice accurately describes the development as shown on the supporting plans as, "first floor rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer, roof lights". I have used this description in my consideration of the appeal since it best describes the proposed development in precise and concise terms.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises 40 Princes Road (No 40), a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling, located on the corner of Princes Road where Princes Road meets Kings Road. The local residential area mainly consists of semi-detached dwellings. The simple and coherent design of the rear elevation and the roof form of No 40 complements the design of 42 Princes Road (to which No 40 is adjoined) and also the rear elevations of the properties found opposite the site on Princes Road to the north of the site.
5. The proposed rear dormer would span across a considerable proportion of the rear roof slope of No 40. Due to its width and height, it would constitute an especially sizeable addition to the roof. It would be visible for some distance down Kings Road past the rear of the site. In these views it would appear as an overpowering feature on the rear of No 40. Due to the large size and scale of the proposed dormer, No 40 would appear out-of-keeping with its context, due to the absence of any similarly-sized rear dormers in view in the street scene.

6. Moreover, the proposed rear dormer would be partially obscured by the roof of the proposed first floor rear extension. The incongruous juxtaposition of these 2 elements would undermine the visual coherence of No 40, resulting in an unattractive appearance. The combination of the above-mentioned factors would mean that, whilst no conflict would arise with the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2011), the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
7. The existing tree within the rear garden would provide some screening of the proposed development. However, even if a condition were imposed to require its retention, it would only partially screen the proposed development, and its function in this respect would likely be much reduced during the winter months. Accordingly, the tree would not adequately mitigate the adverse impacts identified.
8. I observed all of the examples of rear dormers referred to by the appellant, as far as possible from public vantage points, apart from that at Millbrook Gardens which is of limited relevance due to it being situated outside the local area. Those referred to at 10, 70, and 74 Princes Road are not on corner plots. Views of these dormers are heavily filtered from nearby street level by other buildings. Similarly, 36 Milton Road is not situated on a corner plot, and the influence of its rear dormer on the public realm is limited by the dormer only being visible from certain parts of Moss Lane. In contrast, due to the corner location of No 40, the proposed dormer would comprise a prominent and overly-dominant feature in the street scene. As the examples I viewed are not directly comparable with the proposed development, they do not change my findings on this main issue.
9. I therefore find that the proposed development would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan (2016 – 2031) (adopted 2021) (Local Plan) which provides that, amongst other things, residential development should be of a high design quality, and with parts ii. and iv. of Policy 26 of the Local Plan which provides that, amongst other things, the Council will promote high quality design that contributes to the creation of successful places in Havering by supporting development proposals that are of a high architectural quality and design, and respect, reinforce and complement the local streetscene.
10. Paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) provides that, amongst other things, the creation of high quality places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. With this in mind, the harm identified has been given significant weight in opposition to the proposed development.

### **Other Considerations and Planning Balance**

11. Reference has been made to the potential exercise of permitted development rights under Class B of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Given the assurances of the appellant in this respect, I have no reason to doubt that this right would be exercised in the event that this appeal is dismissed.
12. Class B allows for the addition of up to 50 cubic metres over-and-above the original roof space, for semi-detached properties. The appellant has calculated

that the proposed dormer would entail a volume increase of approximately 29 cubic metres.

13. Nevertheless, as explained on the main issue above, the proposed dormer would constitute a sizeable addition, which would encompass the majority of the rear roof space. Hence, it is unlikely that any development under Class B would result in a significantly more prominent and dominating addition to No 40 than is proposed. Furthermore, any development under Class B would not involve a first floor rear extension, as is proposed. Such development would therefore not suffer from the visual incongruity between the 2 elements comprising the proposed dormer and extension, described on the main issue above.
14. The removal of other permitted development rights via a planning condition would not alter the planning implications of the proposed development when compared with the fall-back position. For the above-mentioned reasons, the fall-back position, whilst having a realistic prospect of being implemented, would not be significantly more harmful than the proposed development. As such, it has been given no more than moderate weight in favour of the proposed development.
15. The proposed development would improve the living accommodation available at No 40, to the benefit of its current and future occupiers. However, this would mainly be a private benefit. The proposed development would constitute an efficient use of land, but the scale of its benefits in this regard would not be significant. These matters merit little weight in favour of the proposed development.
16. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan. The totality of the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.

### **Conclusion**

17. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Alexander O'Doherty*

INSPECTOR