



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2022

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/22/3298674

20 Great Nelves Chase, Hornchurch RM11 2PT

- 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 S Claire against the decision of The London Borough of Havering Council.
 - The application Ref P1933.21, dated 8 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a new boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area, with reference to streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is occupied by a detached chalet style bungalow that is located on the inside of a crank in the street at Great Nelves Chase. The plot is wider to its street frontage than other plots in the local area, which is made up of closely neighbouring detached houses and bungalows. It is located within the Emerson Park Policy Area, an area designated for its special residential character, this part of which is defined by medium sized family homes that exhibit a variety of architectural designs.
4. To the front of the appeal property is an existing cranked red brick wall with 4 red brick piers that are located at the front of the appeal property on its boundary with the public highway. The existing brick wall sits between 2 vehicle and pedestrian openings located at either side end of the plot.
5. The proposal is to replace the existing brick wall and piers with a new approximately 0.9 high boundary wall that would be similar in height to the existing. The proposed boundary wall would have 8 brick piers approximately 2.0 metres in height, with an approximately 1.8 metre tall pedestrian gate at the point of the crank in the property boundary with the street. The space between the proposed brick piers above the proposed boundary wall would be infilled with panels of metal railings reaching to approximately 1.8 metres in

height. Automated sliding gates, the same height as the proposed pedestrian gate and railings, are proposed for the retained openings at either end of the appeal property's street frontage.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to the existing boundary treatment to a property opposite the appeal property, which includes railings above a boundary wall set between brick piers and also includes an automated gate of the same height. Whilst there are occasional similar examples of boundary structures to that proposed to the front of residential properties in the area, these are however shorter than the proposed brick piers, railings and gates. It is apparent from my site visit that the character and appearance of the street is defined by considerably shorter boundary structures, similar to that currently at the front of the appeal property.
7. The proposed boundary structure would, therefore, be considerably taller than any others in the rest of the street and immediate local area. In this regard the proposal would not accord with the guidance set out in the Havering Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011), which encourages boundary structures that reinforce the prevailing character of the streetscape.
8. Given the location of the proposal at a crank in the street, it would sit prominently in views along the street. Due to its height would, therefore, appear to be out of scale in relation to the appeal property and incongruous within the context of the local streetscene, which is defined by its medium sized family homes, including the appeal property, which would stand in contrast to the excessive scale of the proposal. The proposal would not, therefore, accord with the guidance given in the Emerson Park Policy Area Supplementary Planning Document (2009), which advises that no new development will be permitted unless its massing and architectural character are compatible with the character of the Emerson Park area.
9. Whilst the proposed gates and railings would be perforated, allowing views through, their function is to enclose and exclude, and would, in combination with the proposed brick piers, provide an imposing and impenetrable and secure boundary. The footway adjacent to the appeal property is narrow and the height and scale of the proposal would, therefore, also result in it having an overbearing presence, which would be experienced as oppressive by pedestrians using this footway.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has raised issues regarding the Council's pre-planning advice and processes. However, this is not a matter for me to consider as part of this appeal. There are other procedures through which the appellant can engage with the Council on this matter.
11. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area, which would conflict with policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan (2021). This seeks to ensure that development is of high quality design, respects the local streetscene and responds to the context of the site and the local distinctiveness and character of the area.

Conclusion

12. As no public benefits have been identified that would outweigh the harm that I have identified above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR