



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2019

by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/19/3227325

10 Tees Drive, Romford RM3 9AJ

- 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 Siva Kumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0018.19, dated 2 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2019.
 - The development is for metal drive gates and fence with addition to the brick pillars.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I note that the application has been submitted retrospectively. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development was already in place. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The application site features a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling located on Tees Drive, opposite the junction with Wrexham Road. The appeal site is located within a predominantly residential area. The proposal seeks retrospective planning permission for the retention of a front boundary wall, railings and gates.
5. The majority of the properties on Tees Drive have driveways to the front which are encompassed by a variety of low brick walls and hedges. Whilst these differ in individual appearance, the area is characterised by the low brick boundary walls. The high metal railings and high brick pillars on the front boundary of 10 Tees Drive contrast starkly with most of the other properties along Tees Drive. Due to the prominence of the development in the street scene it draws the eye and does not contribute positively to the prevailing character of the street scene. I consider that the boundary treatment is significantly different to the character and appearance of the street and is unacceptably dominant and intrusive. Therefore, the development significantly harms the street scene and the appearance of the surrounding area.

6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development is contrary to Policy 7.4 of the adopted London Plan, 2016 and Policy DC61 of the adopted London Borough of Havering's LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD, 2008. These Policies seek to ensure that development respects the character and appearance of the local context.

Other Matters

7. I observed on my site visit that at No 49 Tees Drive there was a similar development with high railings to the front of the property. However, the Council has stated that this development has been in situ since 2008, and that there is no planning history associated with it. In any event, I have to determine this appeal on its individual planning merits, and the presence of the aforementioned development does not justify granting planning permission.
8. Whilst I have sympathy with the appellant and the unfortunate situations that they have had to endure, personal circumstances are rarely determinative. The matters raised by the appellant, including criminal activity, does not outweigh the very significant harm that I have found to the character and appearance of the area, which is a matter of overriding public interest.
9. One of the Council's reasons for refusal relates to the submitted plans not being to scale, making the height and width of the development unclear. However, this is a retrospective proposal and I was able to consider the position and height of the development as part of my site visit.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

D Peppitt

INSPECTOR