



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2020

by Alex Hutson MRTPI CMLI MArborA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3251932

251 Chase Cross Road, Romford RM5 3XS

- 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 Simpson Osifeso against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0291.20, dated 24 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is "Retrospective planning application for retention of black painted metal panels on front and side boundary walls and front gate".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The black painted metal panels on the front and side boundary walls and front gate of the appeal property have already been erected and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling located within a predominantly residential area. Dwellings in the locality typically display front boundary treatments comprising a variety of low-level brick walls, hedges and gates of a modest scale, or a combination of these. The low-key pattern of front boundary development allows views through to front gardens and affords an open quality to the streetscene. This contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Given, their overall height and lack of visual permeability, the black painted panels appear overly dominant, visually incongruous and at considerable odds with the prevailing pattern of front boundary treatments in the locality. In addition, they markedly erode the open quality of the streetscene.
6. Accordingly, I consider that the development gives rise to considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It is thus contrary to Policy DC61 of the Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Plan Document

2008, which requires, amongst other things, development to maintain, enhance or improve the character and appearance of the local area. It is also contrary to the guidance of the Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2011, which advises that boundary treatment should reinforce the prevailing character of the streetscene.

Other matters

7. The appellant suggests that the development provides him with additional security and privacy. Nonetheless, privacy is not normally considered to be as important to the front of a house as it is to the rear. With regard to security, the appellant could explore other means to achieve this, if necessary, such as an alarm or CCTV system, or a secure front boundary treatment which would be more sensitive to the character and appearance of the area. As such, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified and do not justify a planning permission.

Conclusion

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

Alex Hutson

INSPECTOR