

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2024

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/23/3335678

12 Crow Lane, Romford, Essex RM7 0ED

- 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 Julian Onea against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P1479.23.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing rear single storey garage and side extension to donor property to allow for construction of 2 bedroom end of terrace property with parking to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is at the end of a terrace of dwellings, located adjacent to the junction between Crow Lane and Beechfield Gardens. Despite the relatively short length of the terrace, the rhythm and consistent width of the dwellings within it is apparent in views of the site.
4. The proposed dwelling would be located at the end of the terrace. It would be noticeably narrower than the host dwelling and others within the terrace, and would appear as a jarring and contrived feature located in a prominent position near to the junction. The dwelling would extend the massing of the terrace closer to the side boundary. This would have an enclosing and overdominant effect in views of this junction, including from the front of the site as well as along the streetscape of Beechfield Gardens. Due to this incongruous and overbearing design and location, the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host terrace and the wider streetscape.
5. There is an existing single storey extension to the side which would be removed, but this is of a much smaller scale than the appeal proposal and

does not project as close to the side boundary. The existing extension does not therefore justify the scale and footprint of the proposal.

6. The proposal would also match the rooflines and hipped roof design of the host terrace, but this would not be sufficient to overcome the concerns arising from the unsuitable design and location of the proposal.
7. The appellant refers to 14 Crow Lane, which is located on the opposite side of the junction with Beechfield Gardens. No 14 has a large 2-storey extension to the side which also has an enclosing effect on views of the junction. However, the appeal proposal would exacerbate the harm arising from the enclosing effect of the extension to No 14 in views of the junction and along Beechfield Gardens. The appeal proposal would also be apparent as a contrived and constrained dwelling on the site, compared to No 14 which appears as an extension. The proposed dwelling reflects some of the detailing of No 14, including the design of the entrance details and roofline, but this would not be sufficient to mitigate for the jarring appearance of the dwelling located on a constrained site and contrary to the rhythm of the host terrace.
8. I conclude that due to its scale, design and location that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the residential and urban design requirements of Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2021. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in respect of achieving well-designed and beautiful places.
9. The Council refers to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD, but based on the evidence before me this does not relate to new dwellings such as the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

10. I have concluded that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. I am mindful of the benefits of the proposal, including the contribution to the supply of housing. However, the benefits arising from a single dwelling would be limited. The proposal would exceed relevant space standards and provide off-street parking, however a lack of harm on these issues is not a benefit, and even an excess of living and amenity space would carry no more than limited weight as a benefit.
12. On 30 July 2024 the Government published a consultation on proposed reforms to the Framework and other changes to the planning system. A direction of travel has been outlined within the Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) 'Building the homes we need', which I give significant weight as a material consideration.
13. The Council accepts that the 'tilted balance' of paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged due to the Housing Delivery Test results. But even allowing for the Council's housing delivery and the WMS, the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.

14. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR