



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2022

by C Harding BA(Hons) PGDipTRP PGCert MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/21/3287047

38 Ingrebourne Rd, Rainham, RM13 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 Mrs Jacqui Hall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0473.21, dated 12 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed porch at 38 Ingrebourne Rd, Rainham, RM13 9AL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0473.21, dated 12 March 2021 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 38-01R1, 38-02R1, 38-03R2, except in respect of the 1:500 block plan shown on plan 38-01R1.
 - 3) The materials used in the external surfaces of the porch hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. The council have indicated that following the amendment of the proposed porch that there is now a discrepancy between the 1:500 site plan shown on drawing number 38-01R1 and the detail of the porch shown on drawing 38-03R2, in relation to the position of the proposed porch. I am satisfied that the discrepancy is minor, and that the detailed plans and elevations shown on drawing 38-03R2 are sufficiently accurate to assess the proposal without being prejudicial to interested parties.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Ingrebourne Road comprises a mixed streetscene where dwellings exhibit a range of front elevational treatments including porches and canopies of differing scales and designs. Additionally, properties are either semi-detached

or short terraces, with no strong established development frontage. Overall, the character of the area is one of variety. The host property itself currently features an existing pitched roof front porch.

5. Although the proposed porch would be larger than that it would replace, it would not appear as unduly large in terms of height, bulk or mass, when considered in the context of the existing character of the area, a component of which is the variety of front elevational treatments that is evident, including those of a similar size and design to the appeal scheme.
6. Furthermore, the porch would be appropriately sited towards to the centre of the front elevation of the property, reflecting existing properties in the area. With Ingrebourne Road being characterised by small groups of linked properties without a strong rhythm being evident, the proposed development would not appear as unduly prominent or harmful to this character, as its scale would be commensurate with others in the vicinity.
7. The location of the entrance door on the side elevation would be not wholly reflective of the general approach to front elevational treatments in the immediate surrounding area, but neither would it be an isolated outlier in terms of design, with other examples being evident. The proposed porch would also include a window addressing the street, so would not present a blank façade. Consequently, this design approach would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area in this instance.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, I find no conflict with London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD¹ Policy DC61 which seeks to ensure that new development maintains or improves the character of the local area through appropriate scale and design, and response to local distinctiveness.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary in the interests of precision to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. A condition concerning external materials is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

C Harding

INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008