
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2021

by R Bartlett PGDIP URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3262464
60 Brooklands Road, Romford, RM7 7EB

- 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 L Nwanemuogh against the decision of the London Borough of Havering Council.
 - The application Ref P1174.20, dated 19 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a one bedroom two-storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr L Nwanemuogh against the London Borough of Havering Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, on street parking and the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The site is located in a residential area comprising a wide range of house types of varying design and appearance. Houses in this part of Brooklands Road are detached, semi-detached or in small terraced blocks. The spaces between the buildings are a positive characteristic of the area.
5. 60 Brooklands Road is the last semi-detached house on the street as it originally existed. However, the street now extends into a later development known as Ivey Villas.
6. I observed on my site visit that No.1 Ivey Villas, has been extended into the roof and sideways, at full height, up to the boundary of the appeal site. This is not shown on the submitted plans or mentioned by either party. However, it is clearly shown in numerous photographs and images contained within the appellant's Statement of Case and Final Comments.

7. Although the proposed dwelling would be set back from the front elevation of 1 Ivey Villas, the gap of approximately 380mm between the proposal and Ivey Villas and the gap of approximately 300mm between the proposal and 60 Brooklands Road would result in a terracing effect and the loss of an important gap, which separates the two distinctly different street scenes of Brooklands Road and Ivey Villas. The minimal gap also detracts from the setting and identity of the pair of semi-detached houses and the prevailing pattern of development in the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be unduly cramped and harmful to the appearance of the area contrary to policy DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Adopted 2008 (the DPD) and policies D1 and D4 of The London Plan, which collectively seek to ensure new development is of good design, which maintains the character and appearance of the local area.

Parking

9. On street parking on Brooklands Road is limited. There is an existing permit holders scheme in place.
10. The appellant has advised that there is currently only one parking space for residents of No.60 and that this is the single space currently shown immediately to the front of that house. The appellant also states that the appeal site has been legally split from No.60. However, I note that the whole of No. 60 is included within the red line boundary of the appeal site and is declared on the certificates as being within the appellant's sole ownership.
11. I have not been advised what the existing single storey building to the rear of the appeal site is currently used for given that it is claimed to no longer be within the residential curtilage of No.60. A representation made by a local resident suggests that it may be in use as an office. As I have not been advised that it has planning permission for any use other than incidental use to the existing dwelling, it is unlikely to generate any parking requirement at the present time and even if it did, there is currently plenty of parking space to the front of it and to the side of No.60. This would not be the case with the proposed new dwelling.
12. The submitted site and block plans do not appear to accurately represent what exists on the site, omitting the bay window to the front of No. 60, which further reduces the space to the front of the dwelling. The site plan also omits the concrete panels and large brick pillar that mark the entrance to the adjoining development. This pillar and fencing, which partially obstruct the parking area, do not appear to be in the appellant's ownership or control and therefore could not be removed.
13. At the time of my site visit two vehicles were parked diagonally in front of the site of the proposed new dwelling and part of the existing dwelling. It would not have been possible to park a third vehicle on the site without overhanging the footway or for a vehicle to park on the road to the front of the site without blocking these vehicles in.
14. The proposal would therefore result in there being only one off road parking space for the new dwelling and one for No.60. Moreover, it would not be possible for future occupiers of either of these dwellings or their visitors to park

on the road immediately in front of these houses without blocking the access and parking to the other.

15. I acknowledge that despite having a poor PTAL rating of 1 the site is located reasonably close to services and facilities. I have not been provided with a copy of Annex 5 to policy DC33 of the DPD, which sets out maximum rather than minimum parking standards and in any event this policy significantly pre-dates the current London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. The London Plan 2021 sets a maximum parking standard of 1.5 spaces per dwelling regardless of bedroom numbers.
16. There would be space within the rear garden for the storage of bicycles. However, the gap between the houses would not be of sufficient width to allow any access to the rear of the proposed dwelling or indeed the existing one. This would result in occupiers of both houses having to either take their bicycles and waste through their houses, or leave them outside the front of the houses. Neither of these options would in my view be satisfactory nor demonstrate good design.
17. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in the loss of existing on and off road parking spaces, which together with the addition of a new dwelling would increase the pressure for on-street parking elsewhere. However, there is no evidence before me to suggest that this would be detrimental to highway safety and it would not in my view be contrary to the most up to date parking standards, which are those set out in the London Plan 2021. Notwithstanding this view, the absence of any accessible secure cycle storage for occupiers of the existing and proposed dwellings would be contrary to the London Plan.

Living conditions

18. The appellant, despite including several photographs within his appeal statement and final comments showing the extension of 1 Ivey Villas up to the site boundary, claims that there would be a 3.6m gap between the dwellings, which would not be the case, bases the 45 degree zone on the extension not existing, which is not the case and states that there are no windows in the flank wall of 1 Ivey Villas when there clearly is.
19. Given the proximity of the proposal to the south of No.1 Ivey Villas and its projection beyond the rear building line of that property, the development would overshadow the rear of No.1 Ivey Villas and would appear overbearing and over dominant when viewed from the rear windows of that property. It also appears that the gable window to 1 Ivey Villas would be obstructed by the proposed dwelling.
20. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be contrary to policy DC61 of the DPD and the residential design guide SPD, which state that permission will not be granted for proposals that would result in unacceptable overshadowing and loss of sunlight/daylight.

Other Matters

21. Reference is made to an appeal at 2 Brooklands Road relating to an apartment block. I have not been provided with the full details of that case, but based upon the information available that scheme was clearly very different to the one currently before one.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR