



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2024

by A Hickey MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/23/3333557

1A Beaumont Close, Romford, RM2 6LJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Amjad Ali against the decision of London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P1035.23.
 - The development proposed is retrospective planning for a rear out-building
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The site address in the banner heading is taken from the appellant's appeal form rather than the planning application form as it more accurately describes the appeal location.
3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
4. During the appeal, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised. Its content in respect of the main issues has not been materially altered. Therefore, in this instance, it has not been necessary to consult the parties on the revisions to the Framework.
5. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development had commenced. The application made clear that the scheme was submitted as part retrospectively and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

6. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. Beaumont Close is situated within a predominantly suburban area. While the appeal site forms part of a short terrace row the surrounding area is characterised by generally semi-detached dwellings on good sized plots, set back from the main road.
8. As a consequence of the surrounding street layouts, the appeal site's rear garden abuts a number of residential gardens. I observed several outbuildings in nearby gardens from the appeal site, but given the relatively low roof heights and small scales, none were particularly alien or incongruous in this open, verdant residential setting.
9. The proposed building would be a sizable outbuilding located at the foot of the garden. While some of the outbuilding would be sunken into the ground, the outbuilding would still have a tall ridgeline and large footprint. The size of the outbuilding would be uncharacteristic in the surrounding area, where no similarly sized outbuildings are visible from the appeal site. It would be a prominent and incongruous presence when seen from neighbouring properties including many on Beaumont Close, Upper Brentwood Road and Main Road particularly from within their gardens.
10. The appellant states that the outbuilding is of small scale for the purposes of the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Comparative mathematical calculations have been provided to show the outbuilding would be lower in height than the host dwelling with a smaller footprint and volume. However, even when taking these calculations into consideration, building set in distance and the size of the garden the outbuilding would detract from the character of the area particularly the rear garden environments contrary to the aims of the SPD.
11. For the above reasons, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development is contrary to Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan which, among other things, requires that development is high quality and compliments the character of the site and local area. Furthermore, the proposal also conflicts with the SPD which requires outbuildings to not detract from the character of the area and be unobtrusively located.

Living conditions

12. On account of the well-sized rear gardens, there are good levels of outlook from rear windows serving properties on Beaumont Close, Upper Brentwood Road and Main Road. Given the rear elevation distances to the outbuilding I find that adequate levels of outlook would remain. However, the outbuilding would be located in close proximity to many surrounding gardens.
13. The garden of 585 Upper Brentwood Road (No 585) is of an irregular shape and projects beyond the rear garden of the appeal property. As a result of the position of surrounding gardens No 585 has a section of the garden that appears somewhat severed as it narrows before widening again. The section of garden is partially enclosed by outbuildings from properties on Upper Brentwood Road and Main Road. The appeal scheme would have a tall and fairly wide gable wall located a short distance from this section area of the

garden. For users of this area of the garden at No 585 the outbuilding would be overbearing, visually intrusive and detrimentally harmful to outlook.

14. There would be an area of the garden separated only by the existing fence and a small gap between the outbuilding and boundary to 3 Beaumont Close (No 3). However, the garden is of sufficient length and width that the effect of the proposal on the use of the external space of No 3, would not be overbearing or visually intrusive from within the garden.
15. There are a number of outbuildings and verdant boundary treatments situated between the boundary of the appeal site and no's 579-583 Upper Brentwood Road. As a result, the proposed development would not give rise to any harmful effect on the users of these outdoor spaces. Similarly, as a result of distances created by intervening gardens the outbuilding would not have a harmful effect on the users of gardens at 326-332 Main Road.
16. For the above reasons, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 585 with regard to outlook. It would fail to accord with Policy 7 of the Havering Local Plan which, amongst other matters, requires development to avoid unacceptable loss of outlook. The proposal also conflicts with the aims of the SPD in so far as it requires development to not detrimentally affect the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

17. I have considered the appellant's point regarding the contemporary materials. The council could control these through a planning condition. However, this alone would not overcome the harms I have identified above.

Conclusion

18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, sufficient to outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
19. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

A Hickey

INSPECTOR