
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2016

by Andrew McCormack BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/16/3154792

844b Romford Road, Manor Park, London E12 5JP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Cemal Kaplan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 16/00854/FUL, dated 21 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is proposed erection of hoarding on shop forecourt.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated on the south east corner of the junction between Romford Road and Little Ilford Lane. The proposed development relates to a flank brick wall on the western boundary of the site which is around the corner from the main frontage of 844a Romford Road and would face Little Ilford Lane. Romford Road is characterised by commercial units on the ground floor with residential use above whilst Little Ilford Lane is mainly characterised by two storey residential terraced properties.
 4. The proposed hoarding would be advertising the existing business at the appeal site and would be located to the rear of a commercial property. However, it would be positioned on a flank wall around the corner and separate from the main shop frontage and would be on a predominantly residential street. This would result in an overspill of commercial development into the adjacent residential area.
 5. Furthermore, the appeal site is not located within a defined local or town centre boundary as set out in the Newham Core Strategy or the Detailed Sites and Policies DPD. The Council, through its policies is seeking to refocus retail and commercial development within town centre boundaries. The proposal would not accord with this strategy for future development in the area and would contribute to a cumulative adverse impact of ribbon development along Romford Road which partly extend into the wider area and side streets.
-

6. As a result, the proposed hoarding would not correspond to the primary shop frontage of the commercial unit and would therefore appear discordant and at odds with its immediate surroundings. Furthermore, the length of the hoarding would be excessive and would appear as incongruous development along a prominent boundary elevation of the appeal property. I acknowledge the appellant's point that the brick wall is large and would be able to easily accommodate the size of hoarding proposed. However, it is the size, appearance and location of the proposed hoarding which would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area
7. The proposed hoarding would add to the visual clutter in the area. This would have a detrimental effect on the positive contribution the brick flank wall makes to the streetscene by providing a degree of visual and physical separation between the commercial area of Romford Road and the residential area of Little Ilford Road.
8. I note that the appellant has not put forward any benefits in support of the proposal. Whilst there may be some economic benefits resulting from the enhanced advertisement of the business relating to this proposed development, this would not outweigh the material harm I have identified in relation to the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies 2.15, 7.1, 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policies S1, S6, SP1, SP3, SP6 and SP7 of the Newham Core Strategy 2012 and Policy SP8 of the Proposed Submission Draft Detailed Stes and Policies DPD 2015. Amongst other matters, these policies seek to ensure that development is of a high quality of design which respects and does not adversely affect the character and appearance of its surrounding context.

Other Matters

10. I note that the appellant states that the original application did not attract any objection from neighbouring occupiers. Whilst this may be the case, the proposed development must be assessed on its own merits and therefore a lack of any objection does not necessarily lead to the proposal being a suitable and sustainable form of development.
11. The appellant has sought advice through the planning appeal process on how the proposed development could be altered in order to be acceptable. Whilst I acknowledge the appellants' frustration in this regard, such matters would be most appropriately addressed between the appellant and the local planning authority and these are not matters to be dealt with as part of the planning appeal process.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McCormack

INSPECTOR