



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2023 by T Bennett BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/23/3320165

79 Avon Road, Upminster, Essex RM14 1RF

- 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 & Mrs Sven Liebig against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P1647.22, dated 9 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is the addition of insulation and smooth rendered finish to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the addition of insulation and smooth rendered finish to front elevation at 79 Avon Road, Upminster, Essex RM14 1RF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P1647.22, dated 9 October 2022, subject to 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 approved plan reference PL-5 08_05.
 - 3) The external render hereby permitted shall be smooth and painted in Orchid 28088 as specified by email dated 18 September 2023 and retained as such thereafter.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of development used above is taken from the decision notice. It best describes the scheme to which the appeal relates in the most accurate and concise terms. It is also used on the appeal form. Since it does not fundamentally change the proposal as it was first made, no party would be prejudiced by my use of it. I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey, mid-terraced dwelling constructed in red brick, with the exception of No. 77 which has a half-rendered facade. The adjacent block of four properties is also predominantly brick but interjected with one which has a rendered front elevation. Beyond this, elevations in the wider street scene are varied. The majority have been rendered, typically in variations of white or cream, and to a lesser extent beige pebble dash. There is therefore a mixed feel to the outward appearance of buildings in the area.
6. In this context, the proposed render colour would be a variation of cream, similar to the adjacent property and consistent with the many rendered properties in the vicinity. Although the proposed works would undoubtedly alter the appearance of the host property within the terrace, I am not persuaded that the change would be harmful. The proposal would not represent a departure from the prevailing character and appearance of the street, nor would it appear unduly prominent. It would not consequently harm the character or appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would accord with Policy 7 and Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan (2021). Broadly these require proposals to reflect the character of the site and the local area.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard conditions relating to timeliness and the identification of plans, the Council has suggested a condition requiring the external materials of the proposed development to match those of the existing building. Given that render is not currently a material used on the property, this condition is unnecessary. However, and in the interests contextual appropriateness, a condition specifying the colour and texture of the external render is necessary. This has been specified and, having regard to the wider area, it would be acceptable.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above, the scheme would comply with the development plan. There is nothing sufficiently compelling to conclude other than recommending that the appeal should be allowed. Subject to the conditions specified.

T Bennett

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is allowed subject to the stated conditions.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR