



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3258796

16 Hamlet Road, Romford RM5 2DS

- 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 Abdelhak Tighlit against the decision of London Borough of Havering Council.
 - The application Ref P0778.20, dated 20 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is for replacement of garden wall and gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement garden wall and gates at 16 Hamlet Road, Romford, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0778.20, dated 20 May 2020, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A3/3969/203, A3/3969/208 and A3/3969/204

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a pale rendered house that is located on the corner of Hamlet Road and Hamlet Close within an area of similar suburban properties. The appeal property appears to have been previously converted into a house from a bungalow but is nevertheless largely synonymous in its character and appearance with other properties in the area, being of a suburban residential character that is set back from the road.
4. I saw on my site visit that throughout the streetscene there are boundary treatments of some kind to nearly all properties. Most of these are low boundary walls but some have brick piers and railings to the front in a similar manner to those present on the appeal site. What is common to all such boundaries is the visual permeability to be obtained through, or over, such boundary treatments and I consider that this element is the most important consideration when assessing this appeal.

5. Although the appeal scheme has therefore introduced a higher boundary treatment with larger brick piers and gates, I consider that the overall character and appearance of the area is preserved through the visually permeable nature of the railings. As such the proposals allow the open plan character of the area to be maintained and the overall character and appearance of the area to be preserved.

Conclusion

6. I conclude that the proposed wall and railings would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the area, subject to conditions requiring the specification of plans in the interests of certainty. I therefore conclude that there will be no significant adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area and as such no conflict with Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.
7. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Graham

INSPECTOR