

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2020

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01/03/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3261783

15 Glamis Drive, Hornchurch, RM11 3RT

- 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 Rouse against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0953.20, dated 6 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2020.
 - The development proposed was described as *'to replace old summer house with new garden room/summer house'*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to erect a garden room/summer house at 15 Glamis Drive, Hornchurch, RM11 3RT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0953.20, dated 6 July 2020, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The buildings hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 15 Glamis Drive.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was retrospective and the development has already taken place.
3. The application drawings show two separate buildings immediately abutting each other. One is indicated as being a garden room and the other a shed. The buildings as constructed resemble the appearance of the buildings shown on the drawings but internally they are partly connected. There is also a small flue protruding from the roof of the garden room. The differences between the buildings as they are shown on the plans and as they have been built are not significant, and do not materially alter the nature of the development that is before me.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, and upon the living conditions of adjoining occupiers with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, in common with others to this side of Glamis Drive and within the wider area, has a reasonably long rear garden. The buildings are positioned at the foot of the garden and are surrounded by the rear gardens of both neighbouring properties in Glamis Drive and the bottom of the rear garden to 21 Link Way. The levels of the garden noticeably drop away from the rear elevation of the dwelling.
6. Although the buildings occupy the majority width of the plot, they are separated from the side boundaries with Nos 11 and 17 Glamis Drive by around at least 1m. The buildings are obviously single-storey and are positioned well away from the rear elevations of neighbouring dwellings.
7. There is ample garden space retained for the appeal property that is commensurate with the size of other nearby gardens and which is entirely useable and functional. Although the footprint of the development is reasonably large, the impression is of a single building that is domestic in form and appearance, and obviously subordinate to the dwelling in terms of scale and function. Given the overall size of the garden, I found the development to be comfortable in its setting and in-keeping with the residential context of its surroundings. Whilst the development is obviously seen in the outlook from neighbouring properties, due to its single-storey height and domestic form, I do not consider it to be overbearing or intrusive.
8. The Council's *Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document March 2011* (SPD) advises that outbuildings should be subordinate in scale to the existing dwelling and to the plot. It goes on to state that in assessing proposals, the Council will consider factors such as scale, height, proximity to boundaries, roof design, finishing materials and prominence in the rear garden environment. In all of these respects, for the reasons given above, I found nothing about the development that was objectionable or contrary to the SPD guidelines.
9. Suggestions by the Council about the vagaries of the intended use for the buildings are unfounded. The development appeared to me to be obviously intended for purposes incidental to the use of the main dwellinghouse. Furthermore, this could reasonably be controlled by means of a planning condition.
10. Overall, I am satisfied that there is no harm to the character or appearance of the area, or to the living conditions of any neighbouring occupiers. As such, I find no conflict with Policy 61 – *Urban Design* of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008.
11. As the development has been completed, I have no reason to impose any conditions other than one to control its use. This is necessary in the interests

of maintaining the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, in the absence of any other identified conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR