



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2024

by Nick Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/23/3326321

17 Carlisle Road, Romford, Havering RM1 2QP

- 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 T Budding against the decision of the Council for the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0648.23, dated 24 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the sub-division of private garden at rear of number 17 to form a detached dwelling with off street parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in December 2023. As the changes do not materially affect the main issues in this case, the parties have not been invited to make further comments.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - a) the character and appearance of the area;
 - b) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties; and
 - c) highway safety, with particular regard to on-street car parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises the existing dwelling, addressing Carlisle Road, together with its long garden which has a secondary frontage to Kings Grove at the rear. A detached garage exists on this secondary frontage, a situation which is similar to other homes addressing Carlisle Road. This is where the proposed dwelling would be located. As such, it would have the greatest impact upon the character of Kings Grove. The development would not be visible along Carlisle Road due to the terraced houses on this street restricting all views.
5. A terrace of four houses has already been constructed to the north of the appeal site, at 11-14 Kings Grove, in the rear gardens of 5-11 Carlisle Road. However, what is proposed here a single detached dwelling that would be isolated from its residential neighbours and would be set amongst service

structures and garages for dwellings addressing Carlisle Road. It's width, although similar to the host dwelling addressing Carlisle Road and the row of terraces to the north, would be jarring in this context and appear as a very slim and alien looking detached house. It would appear as an isolated two-storey building that bears little relationship with its surroundings. The proposed dwelling would therefore appear as an incongruous feature that would be harmful to the character of the area.

6. As such, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It therefore does not comply with policies 7, 10 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2021 (HLP) and the provisions of the Framework. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development respects the character and appearance of the area.

Living conditions

7. The proposed dwelling would be located at the rearmost part of the garden to number 17 Carlisle Road. The immediate neighbours to number 17 share similar arrangements with the main homes being located at the other end of the long gardens from the site of the proposed dwelling. Although the proposed dwelling would be a reasonably large structure, it would be well removed from these neighbouring dwellings. The long and narrow gardens are unlikely to be used as intensively as the homes themselves or garden areas closest to them.
8. This distance is more than sufficient to ensure that the building would not appear intrusive or overbearing. There may be some overshadowing to part of the gardens, nevertheless would be unlikely to materially affect the homes themselves. The side windows could be obscure glazed and fixed shut by way of condition to mitigate overlooking. However, given the distances involved and that these windows are at right angles to the plot orientation, I do not consider this necessary.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and the proposal complies with policies 7 and 26 of the HLP. These policies, amongst other matters, aim to ensure that development does not adversely affect living conditions.

Highway safety

10. The development would remove the existing detached garage at the rear and thus result in the host property having no parking available. However, this garage is clearly of an inadequate size to accommodate a vehicle. Moreover, the entrance to the garage is overgrown and has clearly not been used for vehicle parking in quite some time. There would, in practice, be no loss of vehicle parking for the host dwelling. The proposed dwelling provides one space which accords with HLP requirements.
11. As I have not identified any material increase in demand for on street vehicle parking, it follows that there would be no adverse effects upon highway safety. The development therefore complies with policies 23 and 24 of the HLP. These policies address transport connectivity and vehicle parking provision.

Planning Balance

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposed dwelling would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. However, it would not result in any material harm to the living conditions of neighbours or result in unacceptable harm to highway safety. I recognise the proposed dwelling would have acceptable floorspace, garden area and parking provision with an electrical outlet for vehicle charging. However, these matters are neutral considerations.
13. The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply of deliverable housing sites. Consequently, the provisions of paragraph 11(d)ii of the Framework should be applied.
14. The Framework makes it clear that due weight should be given to existing policies according to their degree of consistency with the Framework. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The Framework seeks to ensure that development creates spaces with a high standard of design, and I give significant weight to the conflict between the proposal and policies 7, 10 and 26 of the HLP in this respect.
15. Set against the identified harm, the proposal would make an efficient use of land within an existing urban area and meet the Framework's objectives of boosting the supply of housing. However, the benefits associated with a single new dwelling would be minimal in the context of the Borough's overall shortfall. Nevertheless, I give the provision of this additional dwelling, in these circumstances, moderate weight.
16. However, overall, I conclude that the adverse impacts on the character of the area would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

17. The conflict I have found means that the development would not comply with the policies of the development plan, read as a whole. The Framework is an important other material consideration, and the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. However, as set out above, the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. There are no material considerations which warrant a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Bowden

INSPECTOR