



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2024 by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/23/3329334

7 Parkside Avenue, Havering, Romford RM1 4NA

- 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 Lee Maynard against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application ref. P0955.23, dated 16 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as remove existing hardstanding drive and flower beds to be replaced with hardstanding block paving with drainage and soak away.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as the removal of existing hard standing drive and flower beds to be replaced with hard standing block paving with drainage and soak away and new boundary wall at 7 Parkside Avenue, Havering, Romford RM1 4NA in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. P0955.23, dated 16 June 2023, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans insofar as they relate to the boundary wall and hardstanding only: TQRQM22164134939489; 238/500 P4; 238-601 P1; and 238-600 P2.

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 Matters

3. The description in the banner header is taken from the application form. I have omitted the reasons for the application as they bear no relevance to the development in question. For the purposes of this decision, and in the interest of preciseness, I have used the description from the decision notice as it also refers to the new boundary wall.
4. The Council refer to a porch on the plans and changes to a previously approved garage. They seem satisfied that the porch would meet the allowances under permitted development. There is no reason for me to disagree but neither this nor the changes to the garage form part of the appeal scheme. I have drafted the relevant condition accordingly.

5. At the time of the site visit, works were underway for alterations to the front garden, appearing similar to that depicted on the plans. It is on these that my recommendation has been made.

Main Issue

6. The Council's reason for refusal focusses on the proposed boundary wall. They do not appear to have substantive concerns over other elements of the scheme. The main issue is therefore the effect of the boundary wall on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. Along with others, the dwelling's front garden provides separation from the highway bestowing the street scene with a spacious feel. A number of boundaries between gardens are delineated by a variety of fences, walls and hedgerows. The modest height of which preserve the open quality of the street.
8. Whilst the proposed boundary wall would be approximately 1.7 metres at its highest, this would comprise a small segment closest to the property. The majority of the wall would be approximately 1.4 metres, appearing similar to that of the surrounding boundary treatments, preserving the area's prevailing aesthetic. The wall would therefore appear unobtrusive in the street scene, conserving the existing spacious character. Consequently, the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area. It would thus accord with Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016 – 2031 (2021) which, when read together, require new development to be of high-quality design and respect the distinctive qualities of the local area. The proposal would also comply with the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011) which, amongst other things, requires boundary treatments to reinforce the prevailing character of the streetscape.

Conditions

9. It is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. As work has already commenced, the time condition is not required. Given the variety of boundary treatments in the area, it is not reasonable or necessary to specify the type of brick to be used.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. As such, I recommend it be allowed, subject to the condition set out.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the condition above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR