The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2019

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/19/3235265
57 Glenton Way, Rise Park, Romford, Essex RM1 4AQ

- 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 Mrs Susan Glister against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
- The application Ref P1852.18, dated 30 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2019.
- The development proposed has been described as a 2 storey – 3 bedroom dwelling abutting 57 Glenton Way, Rise Park, Romford.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has advised that the Havering Community Infrastructure Levy has been adopted since the determination of the planning application and that the development would be liable to contribute. The Council has identified that the contribution replaces the requirement to contribute towards the provision of education facilities under the terms of an agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The third reason for the refusal of the application has therefore been withdrawn and I have proceeded on that basis.

3. Although it has been stated that plans were submitted to the Council which amend the proposed dwelling to be a 2 bedroom dwelling, that is not the development that has been described within the appeal submissions and the plans that I have been presented show that the proposed dwelling would include 3 bedrooms. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the proposal that is before me.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

    - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

    - Whether the extension would give rise to vehicular conflict and inconvenience as a result of the proposed parking arrangements.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is located within a residential area which is dominated by semi-detached two storey dwellings of similar scale and appearance, albeit several of the dwellings appear to have been extended. Terraced dwellings are located on the opposite side of Glenton Way to the appeal site and within Glenton Close. The consistency of the house types and the formal arrangement of the dwellings, with a consistent set back from the road and spacing around the dwellings, creates a strong suburban character to the locality.

6. The appeal site is located at the junction of Glenton Way and Glenton Close and therefore represents a corner plot on which a two storey semi-detached dwelling is located, with a large side garden that provides a setback from the road. The application would see the erection of a dwelling at the side of the existing building, thereby creating a terrace of 3 dwellings.

7. As set out above, the setback of the dwellings from the roads provide a degree of uniformity and spaciousness to the character of the area which is appreciated from various vantage points that are within the public domain. This is particularly important at this corner plot where the gap between the dwelling and the road demarks the junction and enables views into the southern part of Glenton Way. Only a small gap would be retained between the proposed dwelling and the boundary and therefore the built form would dominate the corner plot and restrict views. Similarly, whereas the existing side elevation is approximately aligned with the front of the dwellings of Glenton Way to the south, the proposed dwelling would sit well forward of the building line and the rear of the dwelling would therefore appear particularly prominent in views from the south.

8. Furthermore, the creation of a terrace of dwellings on this side of Glenton Way would substantially disrupt the formal layout, arrangement and pattern of semi-detached built form. Therefore, whilst the dwelling would be designed to match the scale and appearance of the existing dwelling, the proposal would have a significant effect on the rhythm of the built form within the locality which would not be complimentary to or respectful of the character and appearance of the area.

9. Whilst the dwelling to the opposite side of Glenton Way has been extended to the side, sufficient space has been retained between that extension and the side boundary of the plot for the view into the southern part of Glenton Way to not become unduly enclosed. That extension is subservient to the host dwelling and a degree of spaciousness has been retained at that plot which has ensured that the dwelling does not dominate the corner plot. The effect of that development on the character and appearance of the area is therefore substantially different to the proposal that is the subject of this appeal.

10. Overall, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to policy DC61 of the Havering London Borough Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (CSDCP), adopted 2008, which requires that development enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area by responding to patterns of development and reinforcing, defining and embracing the street.

Car Parking

11. A single car parking space would be provided to the front of the existing and proposed dwellings and the existing garage to the rear of the site would be removed.

12. To align with the parking space for the proposed dwelling, it appears that the access onto the carriageway would have to be located on or very close to the apex of the kerb at the junction of Glenton Way and Glenton Close. Due to this arrangement, there would be an increased likelihood of conflict between road users. Although I have not been provided with any standards or guidance in relation to the Council's design expectations for an access, my experience leads me to conclude that conflict between road users would be likely to arise at this junction as a result of the development proposed, to the detriment of highway safety.

13. Policies DC33 of the CSDCP and 6.13 of the London Plan (LP), adopted 2016, indicate that parking standards should be considered as a maximum. However, Table 6.2 of the LP states that higher levels of parking provision should be considered in areas of outer London with low Public Transport Accessibility Level ratings, such as the appeal site, to address overspill parking pressures. Moreover, paragraph 106 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that maximum parking standards should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary.

14. No evidence has been provided of any existing parking pressures, but the presence of demarked spaces that extend onto the footway indicates that some car parking management has been required in the locality. To avoid creating or worsening any parking pressures that exist, in the interests of highway safety, I consider that it is appropriate to require the provision of off-street parking to serve the proposed development. As such, it is not appropriate to impose a condition to require the removal of the car parking from the proposal as this would render the development contrary to the abovementioned content of the LP. Even if parking was not required, the change to the proposal would be so significant that it would not be reasonable to impose a condition to that effect. Therefore, a condition cannot be used to overcome the highway safety concerns that have been set out above.

15. For these reasons, whilst I have no basis to conclude that inconvenience would arise that would significantly alter the living conditions of residents within the locality, the development would give rise to unacceptable vehicular conflict as a result of the proposed parking arrangements. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy 6.13 and linked Table 6.2 of the LP which combine to require that car parking is provided within developments at locations that are served by fewer public transport options in order to address parking overspill. I also find that the proposal is contrary to paragraph 108 of The Framework which requires that developments are served by a safe and suitable access.

16. Although the proposal does not conflict with policy DC33 of the CSDCP, this does not outweigh the harm that has been identified and the conflict with The Framework and the other policies of the development plan.

Other Matters

17. The appellant has identified that the proposal would meet a need that exists for additional dwellings. However, this need has not been quantified by the appellant and the benefits arising from the provision of one dwelling at the site would not outweigh the harm that has been identified in relation to the main issues. Furthermore, the absence of objections from local residents does not mitigate or compensate for the harm that would arise.

18. The appellant has also highlighted that pre-application advice was sought from the Council which indicated support for the proposal. Frustrations have also been set out with respect to the manner in which the application was processed and considered by the Council. However, my assessment must be based on the planning merits of the proposal alone and not the conduct or interactions of the main parties.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR