



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/19/3236372

24 & 26 Dunmow Drive, Rainham RM13 7UD

- 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 Daly at Damer Properties Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0638.19, dated 18 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is 3 new bungalows constructed adjacent to 2no. existing properties with parking, garages, landscaping and raised timber decking area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on i) the character and appearance of the area, and ii) the living conditions of residents of neighbouring properties with regard to the quality of the gardens and loss of outlook from 24 and 26 Dunmow Drive.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site lies between 24 Dunmow Drive (No 24) and 26 Dunmow Drive (No 26). The host properties are each end-of-terrace dwellings, set perpendicularly to each other at the end of a cul-de-sac in a planned residential area. The area is characterised by two storey dwellings, generally set in terraces with a regular form, rhythm, layout and relationship to each other. On a street where most properties already have reasonably large gardens, the host dwellings benefit from larger plots due to their corner location. This gives a spacious character and appearance to both the end of the cul-de-sac and the host properties in particular.
4. In common with much of the area, there is a road to the rear of the site, allowing access to garages and outbuildings, although it is narrow and unadopted. At present, the gardens of both properties have a number of outbuildings, trees and shrubbery, typical of domestic properties.
5. The proposed development, of three hipped-roof bungalows with amenity space and parking to the rear, set at an angle across the site would not relate well to the existing form and pattern of development in Dunmow Drive or the wider area. As a result, the form, layout and relationship of the proposal to neighbouring properties and the wider area would appear somewhat alien. It

would degrade the otherwise regular form, rhythm and layout of this planned residential area and would appear unduly prominent as a result of its unusual form and layout. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to two bungalow developments to the rear of Blacksmiths Lane, and I was able to see these on my site visit. Whilst I acknowledge that there are similarities with the appeal proposal in so far as bungalows are proposed to the rear of existing properties, the character, context and setting are in my view very different to those of the appeal site. Blacksmiths Lane has a more mixed character and appearance than Dunmow Drive and its surroundings, being less consistent in terms of building height, style and appearance. In addition, the layout of, and relationship to the host properties of the developments on Blacksmiths Lane are more regular than proposed in this appeal. As a result, I do not consider that these developments offer support to the proposal, and they do not change my conclusions above.
7. The appellant has also directed me towards a development on Ford Close (which they have referred to as Ford Road) which they claim has a similar pattern of development to the appeal proposal. That area, which I saw on my site visit, has a more formal layout and regular relationship to the road layout and other properties than the appeal proposal. Therefore, I do not consider that it lends support to the appeal proposal, and it does not change my conclusions on the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008 (the Core Strategy). This policy seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that only development which maintains, enhances or improves the character or appearance of an area is allowed, and that development responds to and complements the form and pattern of development in an area.

Living conditions

9. Owing to the proposed arrangement of the bungalows to the rear of the host properties and their relative heights, the proposal will change the outlook from No 24 and No 26. The currently large, spacious gardens would be divided and developed and the proposal would be visible from No 24 and No 26. However, I do not necessarily consider that the visibility of the proposal from the host properties causes harm in itself.
10. However, I am concerned about the effect of the proposal on the size, shape, and therefore quality of the gardens of the host properties and the outlook that would be afforded to them as a result. At present, the gardens of No 24 and No 26 are splayed to address the corner between them. As a result, and to ensure wider gardens for their terraced neighbours, their opposite boundaries are also somewhat splayed.
11. The proposed site layout would significantly narrow and constrain the gardens of both host properties and result in gardens that would appear contrived and awkward. Furthermore, the outlook from both properties into and along their gardens would be significantly constrained. This would be inconsistent with the established generally spacious and regular character of the gardens and plots in this area. I consider that this effect on both the quality of the garden spaces

and outlook from 24 and 26 Dunmow Drive would be harmful and therefore unacceptable.

12. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy, which seeks amongst other things to ensure that development is well designed, maintains, enhances or improves the area, improves quality of life and does not prejudice the satisfactory development of the area.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge that the proposal has the potential to deliver additional housing, including bungalows and that this could increase the range and choice of housing within the City and Borough. I also acknowledge that the proposal meets space standards, seeks to use matching materials and provide appropriate levels of parking, storage and outdoor space for the proposed new dwellings. As an overarching aim, this is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, the London Plan and the Core Strategy. However, the delivery of housing must be balanced against the protection of the character and appearance of the local area and the protection of the living conditions of occupiers of existing properties, and I have found above that the proposal causes harm in those regards.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR