



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/21/3270583

24 Eastbury Road, Romford, RM7 9AL

- 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 Toni Richardson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1433.20, dated 1 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch at 24 Eastbury Road, Romford, RM7 9AL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P1433.20 dated 1 October 2020 and in accordance with the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Drawing 02 Proposed GA Plan, Elevations and Section.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace dwelling located in a residential area.
 4. Eastbury Road is characterised by the presence of semi-detached and short rows of terraced housing. There are gaps in between rows and pairs of dwellings and whilst the building line is similar along the length of the road, it is not uniform and this results in some houses sitting either forward or behind it.
-

5. Houses along Eastbury Road are set back behind the pavement and front garden and/or parking areas. During my site visit, I observed cars parked on driveways directly in front of dwellings to be a common feature and that to some degree, it is parked cars rather than the dwellings themselves that draw the eye.
6. Also during my site visit, I noted that many houses along Eastbury Road have been altered and or extended. In this regard, I observed that entrances and porchways along the street vary significantly.
7. The proposed front porch has been carefully designed to provide sufficient space for the storage, turning circle and charging of an electric wheelchair. In achieving this, the proposal has also sought to minimise both the forward projection and the overall size of the porchway. Indeed, the proposal would project only a short distance further than the neighbouring porch at Number 34 Eastbury Road.
8. Further, as an end of terrace property, the proposed porch would sit alongside a gap between neighbouring dwellings and this factor, along with the sensitive design of the proposal, would lessen any possible visual impact arising.
9. The short projection, narrow width and modest, functional appearance of the proposed porch would result in a development that would appear neither bulky nor intrusive. The design would add interest to and complement the appearance of the terraced row of which the appeal property forms part. It would also appear in keeping with the character of a road characterised by ongoing investment in minor alterations and extensions.
10. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2016) Policy 7.4; Core Strategy¹ policy DC61; or to the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2011), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

11. Whilst it would comprise a very small development, it is clear to me from the detailed evidence provided that the proposed porch would result in very significant benefits to the health and wellbeing of the occupiers of the appeal property. This is a factor that adds significant weight to my decision below.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests set out in Paragraph 55 of the Framework. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition controlling external finishes is necessary in the interests of local character.

¹ Reference: Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008).

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal succeeds.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR