



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: 28 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3250294
100 Havering Road, Romford RM1 4RB

- 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 Atiqur Rahman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1925.19, dated 30 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of boundary walls gates and railings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling located on the corner of Havering Road and Ashmour Gardens. The area is predominantly residential in character and displays detached and semi-detached dwellings of a variety of architectural styles. However, dwellings in the locality typically display boundary treatments to their frontages comprising a variety of low brick walls, low railings, hedges and gates of a modest scale, or a combination of these. The low-key pattern of frontage boundary development affords an open quality to the streetscene and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The frontage and side boundary treatment of the appeal property currently comprises a number of tall brick piers with low brick walls and ornate railings or gates between them to around the height of the brick piers. Boundary treatment along the rear garden of the appeal property, which adjoins Ashmour Gardens, currently comprises high brick piers with solid brick walls and a gate between them. It is my understanding that the boundary treatment was constructed in the recent past without planning permission and a retrospective application¹ to formalise it was refused by the Council. It is also my understanding that the boundary treatment it replaced included low walls and low railings to the front and side of the appeal property, consistent with the

¹ Council Ref: P0626.19

character and appearance of the area, and a higher wall and gates adjacent to its rear garden.

5. The proposal effectively seeks a similar boundary treatment to that as currently exists, though, as I am informed, approximately 0.2 metres (m) lower in height. The submitted plans indicate that the boundary treatment would, in the round, have a consistent height of approximately 1.8m, albeit with three double gates a degree higher than this.
6. With regard to the proposed boundary treatment alongside the rear garden of the appeal property, this would not, as I understand it, be materially different to that which previously existed in this location. This component of the proposal would thus seem to me to be appropriate and acceptable.
7. I also acknowledge that the proposed boundary treatment to the frontage and side of the appeal property would allow views through, would not impact any landscape features and would maintain a definition between the public and private realm. However, given its overall height and the use of ornate railings and wide gates, it would appear at considerable odds with the prevailing low-key frontage boundary treatment which is typical of the locality and would noticeably erode the open quality of the streetscene. The proposal would thus, overall, appear overly dominant and visually intrusive and would give rise to considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal would therefore be 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 would also be 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

9. I have had regard to a letter from a general practitioner in support of the proposed boundary treatment. This relates to a need to provide a safe and secure home. However, there are likely to be other measures available to achieve this, including an alternative form of boundary treatment, which would be more sensitive to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the matter does not outweigh the harm I have found and does not justify a planning permission.

Conclusion

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

Alex Hutson

INSPECTOR