



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2024

by A Hickey MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/23/3325883

22 Glenton Way, Romford RM1 4AG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Z Mahal against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0678.23.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed single storey rear extension, and proposed new dwelling to side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development cited in the planning application form differs to that contained within the decision notice and appeal form. While not objecting to a change of description there is no evidence that this change was formally agreed by the appellant. In the interests of clarity, I rely upon the description as included in the application form for the purposes of the heading above.
3. Since the appeal was lodged an updated National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. However, the relevant parts have not materially changed therefore I have not sought further comments from the parties.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. This section of Glenton Way is characterised by semi-detached properties set back from the road by well-sized gardens and driveways. Terraced dwellings are located close to either end of Glenton Way at the junctions. While a small number of dwellings have seen some minor alteration or extension and noting the site is not within a conservation area, this does not alter the formal arrangement of the dwellings, which together with coherent design features and materials, provides a pleasant character and uniformity to the area.
6. The appeal site is located on a bend and therefore represents a corner plot. The site is occupied by a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a large side garden that provides a setback from the road. On my visit, I saw how the

appeal property, with its verdant wrap-around garden, provides some visual relief to an otherwise relatively dense suburban area.

7. Matching ridge and eaves heights alongside similar materials would help the development assimilate with other nearby dwellings. However, only a small gap would be retained between the proposed dwelling and the boundary. As a result, the scale of development proposed located close to the bend would appear cramped and overly dominant within the plot, which would be emphasised by the short front garden and projecting two-storey rear extension beyond the existing dwelling.
8. This position also results in the proposed dwelling projecting past the front elevation of 18 and 20 Glenton Way. As a result of its location sitting forward of No's 18 and 20, the introduction of the dwelling would appear as an incongruous addition within the streetscene. This would be particularly evident to those travelling from the junction at Glenton Way and Helmsdale Road toward the appeal site. In contrast to the proposed scheme, the existing layout with 14 and 16 Glenton Way being on a staggered building line assists in the immediate area having a more open feel.
9. Moreover, the dwelling would result in an unwelcome and awkward intrusion of built form on this verdant bend on Glenton Way and a significant erosion of the existing openness, which contributes positively to the area's character and appearance.
10. Introducing a new dwelling in this location would have a considerably greater impact on the openness of the street, given its size and position close to the footway compared to the existing boundary treatments. As such, I attract little weight to this matter.
11. My attention has been brought to schemes allowed by the Council at 7a Glenton Way, 42a Helmsdale Road and 50 Helmsdale Road. Limited evidence is before me to explain the Council's reasoning for permitting the developments. Therefore, I cannot be certain that these cases are directly comparable to the proposal before me. Furthermore, each case must be determined on its own merits, and such proposals are subject to various site-specific considerations and judgements. Consequently, the examples provided are of limited relevance to my considerations and do not alter my conclusions on the proposal. Moreover, I am not bound by the previous decisions of the Council in any case.
12. The main parties have also brought my attention to a number of appeals¹. While I do not have full details, the development at Front Lane was not for a new dwelling but for extensions to an existing dwelling. The scheme at Barton Avenue was located within a cul-de-sac. In this regard, the examples provided are materially different to the appeal proposal, and therefore I cannot draw any direct comparisons that weigh in favour of the proposal. Additionally, there is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate the Inspector for the appeal at 57 Glenton Way was not aware of developments approved nearby.
13. For the reasons above, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development is contrary to Policies 7, 10 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan (HLP). Collectively, these seek new development to be of a high quality design which respects,

¹ Refs: APP/B5480/D/22/3309806, APP/B5480/W/22/3301212 and APP/B5480/W/19/3235265

reinforces and compliments the streetscene. The development would also conflict with the Framework as it would not be sympathetic to local character.

14. The Council's reason for refusing the application also refers to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (REASPD). As the REASPD states, its purpose is not to provide advice on new dwellings. Therefore, in so far as it relates to the Council's main concerns I find no conflict with it.

Other Matters

15. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
16. The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year housing land supply. Therefore, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 11 d) ii. and footnote 8 of the Framework, permission should be granted, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
17. The Framework seeks to boost the housing supply and highlights the important contribution small and medium sized windfall sites that can be built out quickly can make whilst supporting development which makes efficient use of land. The proposal would make a small contribution of one additional dwelling to the supply of housing in an urban area with connections to services and facilities and therefore, I attribute modest weight to this benefit.
18. Against the benefits is the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. The Framework requires development to be sympathetic to local character and development that is not well designed to be refused. The proposal would conflict with Policies 7, 10 and 26 of the HLP, which carries significant weight against the scheme.
19. Consequently, I find that the adverse impacts of the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. The proposal would therefore not represent a sustainable form of development.

Conclusion

20. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
21. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hickey

INSPECTOR