



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2023 by Darren Ellis MPlan MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/23/3318993

Land adjacent to 6 Fairford Way, Romford RM3 9YR

- 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 Mrs Oksana Poliuk against the decision of Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0271.22, dated 28 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of one 2-bedroom, two-storey dwelling with associate parking and amenity space and patio.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is the side garden of the current end terraced property. An approved two-storey side extension thereto has not been constructed and its planning permission has lapsed. The area is predominantly terraced properties that have a similar design and features, with the ends set further back and having wide hipped roofs. This has created a pleasing uniformity.
 5. The terrace containing Nos 2, 4 and 6 appears to be designed as part of a larger one, with No 6 having the dual-pitched roof of a mid-terrace instead of the hipped roof of an end. The proposed dwelling would be set back from No 6, similar to other ends, but it would have a comparatively narrow gabled roof with a hipped element to the front that is not found elsewhere in the street.
 6. The terrace is built on a slope, with ridges stepping down to follow it. The proposal would be built at the top of the slope but would have a ridge lower than No 6, which would be at odds with the established pattern. Furthermore, the dwelling would be significantly narrower than others. With this and the above in mind, it would not represent a harmonious addition to the terrace but
-

rather would appear cramped and contrived in its plot and detrimentally affect the area's pleasant uniformity.

7. The previously approved two-storey side extension shows that such an extension is acceptable in principle. However, an extension to a house is different in character and function to a separate dwelling. In addition, the extension did not have a front gable feature and the Council concluded that it was acceptable, which is not the case here. As such, this previous approval does not justify the proposed new dwelling.
8. The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and as such would be contrary to Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2021 (HLP) and Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021 (LP), which both require development to be of a high standard of design that respects local character.

Other Matter

9. The Council states that the floor to ceiling height for the majority of the gross internal area falls short of the minimum requirements of LP Policy D6 and as such does not satisfy HLP Policy 7. However, this was not a reason for refusal and as I am recommending that the appeal is dismissed on other grounds, this matter is not therefore determinative. I have not investigated it further.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. One additional dwelling would make little meaningful difference to supply. There would be social and economic advantages that would arise from the construction and occupation of a new house, but these would be time and scale limited. The harm to the character and appearance of the area would be long lasting and as such I ascribe it significant weight. Conflicting as it would with the Framework and the appropriateness of design in section 12
11. Therefore, even if the most important policies were out of date and the circumstances of paragraph 11 d) ii) of the Framework applied, the adverse impacts of granting a planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits that would flow from the provision of one new dwelling, when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole. The presumption in favour of sustainable development would not therefore apply.
12. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations, including the approach of the Framework and worthy of sufficient weight, that would indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I thus recommend the appeal be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis I dismiss the appeal.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR