



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2023

by H Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/22/3304998

214 Lodge Lane, Havering, Romford, RM5 2ET

- 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 B.S. Cheema against the decision of London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0580.22, dated 30 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a two-storey end-of-terrace house, with associated car parking, waste storage and amenity space to 214 Lodge Lane.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the area;
 - highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property occupies a prominent corner location at the junction of Turpin Avenue and Lodge Lane and comprises one half of a semi-detached unit. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of house types, most of which occupy generous sized plots and include well-proportioned gardens. The position of properties within their plots, their set back from the highway together with the relatively wide road junctions in the area create a sense of spaciousness and openness which positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
4. Unlike neighbouring dwellings which are generally set back from the highway, the footprint of the proposed 2 storey dwelling would extend the full width of the plot, bringing the side elevation of the proposed property level with the site boundary. The loss of lateral space together with the solid boundary wall would undermine the spaciousness of the road junction and disrupt the balance displayed. Moreover, the size of the rear garden relative to the proposed dwelling would be at odds with the established development pattern, in particular the lower building density.
5. The first floor would be set back whilst the proposed 2 storey rear projection would overlap the rear elevation of the host property. Although the ridge height of the proposed development would be subservient to 214 Lodge Lane (the existing

dwelling) and the scheme would incorporate sympathetic materials and fenestration, the width of the proposed rear projection would be disproportionate to the proposed dwelling. As such, it would disrupt the existing balance displayed at the rear of the appeal property. The effect of which would be exacerbated by the prominent location of the appeal site. For these reasons, I find that the proposed development would read as an incongruous and intrusive form of development.

6. In coming to this conclusion, I am mindful that the proposed development would replace an existing single storey extension. Nevertheless, by virtue of its height and footprint, the existing addition is not overly prominent and does not detract from the spaciousness of the area. This therefore does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
7. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2021 (Local Plan). Amongst other aspects, this policy seeks to ensure that development proposals are of a high architectural quality and design which respond to local building forms and patterns of development. Although I have had regard to the appellant's references to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in relation to the principle of development, for the above reasons, I find the proposal to be inconsistent with the Framework's design objectives.
8. The Council's reason for refusal refers to a number of London Plan Policies, including D4, D6 and D8. Policy D4 concerns the process of design scrutiny rather than site or area specific design considerations whilst Policies D6 and D8 relate to housing quality and the public realm respectively. For these reasons, the aforementioned policies are not determinative to this main issue.

Highway safety

9. For the purpose of Policy T6.1 of The London Plan, the appellant contends that the appeal site falls under 'Inner London PTAL 2' and therefore 0.5 parking spaces would be required. However, given that the appeal site is located within the Havering borough, it seems to me that it could not be reasonably described as being within inner London. Consequently, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the Council's evidence which indicates that the appeal site is located within an area that has poor access to public transport (PTAL 1b).
10. Assuming a PTAL value of 1b, Local Plan Policy 24 requires one parking space to serve the proposed dwelling and 1.5 spaces to serve the existing dwelling. The submitted plans demonstrate that a single parking space would be provided within the site frontage to serve the proposed dwelling whilst a single garage would be provided to the rear of the appeal site for the existing dwelling. Although the Council's concerns regarding the width of the proposed garage are noted, the submitted plans do not indicate to me that the structure would be unacceptably narrow. As such, I am satisfied that the proposed garage would provide a functional off-road parking space.
11. Although the parameters of the appellant's Parking Stress Survey may not fully align with the Lambeth Parking Survey Guidance Note, the evidence nonetheless provides a reasonable reflection of the current demand for on-street parking in the area. Therefore, whilst the off-street provision for the existing dwelling would fall short of the required standards, on the basis of the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the additional parking space required by Local Plan Policy 24 would be accommodated in the area without adversely affecting on-street parking through displacement.

12. Notwithstanding the above, drivers exiting the proposed parking areas would have limited visibility of pedestrians on the footway or indeed other highway users due to the extent of the respective built forms. As such, I am not persuaded that motorists and pedestrians would be able to anticipate each other's movements and stop as appropriate. Furthermore, the proximity of the proposed parking provision to the existing road junction would be an additional hazard, compounding the highway safety issues arising from the inadequate visibility splays. Therefore, whilst the proposed parking provision would utilise existing crossovers and has been designed to comply with Manual for Streets guidance, for the reasons outlined, I find the proposal would be prejudicial to highway safety. In reaching this conclusion, I am mindful that the existing access points have been utilised for a period of 5 years without any road incidents having been recorded and that the installation of a roller shutter door could be secured by condition.
13. Therefore, in concluding this matter, I find that the proposed development would have an adverse effect on highway safety and thus conflicts with Policy T4 of the London Plan together with Local Plan Policy 23. Amongst other aspects, these policies seek to ensure safe and efficient use of the highway thus avoiding adverse impacts to the transport network and its users. The proposal is also inconsistent with the Framework's highway safety objectives.
14. The Council's reason for refusal refers to London Plan Policy D6 which relates to housing quality and standards together with Policy D8 which relates to public realm proposals. However, my attention has not been drawn to any wording within the respective policies that relate to the main issue. Furthermore, whilst noting the reference to sight lines within Local Plan Policy 26, it appears to me that this is within the context of urban design and not the provision of highway related visibility splays. As such, I do not consider Policy 26 to be relevant to this main issue.

Other Matters

15. Although limited details have been provided, my attention has been drawn to a number of consented schemes, which the appellant contends are of a similar nature to the appeal proposal. Based upon the description of development, it would appear that the planning permissions referred to relate to householder development and therefore do not strictly compare to the appeal proposal. In any case, these sites are located within different areas of the borough and therefore do not form part of the character and appearance of the area in which the appeal site is located. Accordingly, I give these examples limited weight in my considerations.
16. The submitted Design and Access Statement indicates that the proposal has been designed to reflect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, would be compliant with the relevant internal space standards and would utilise energy efficient building techniques. It is also noted that cycle storage and refuse provision would be provided within the site boundary and that additional landscaping would be implemented. I am also mindful that the appeal site is not located within a Conservation Area or indeed listed. Nevertheless, in acknowledging the above together with the fact that the proposed development would contribute to the supply and mix of housing in the area, I find that the benefits would be relatively limited given the scale of the development proposed. Consequently, whilst having regard to the above matters, they do not outweigh the harm I have identified or the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

17. In concluding this appeal, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

H Wilkinson

INSPECTOR