



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/24/3354796

1A The Sheilings Havering, HORNBURCH, RM11 2QD

- 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 Sunil Sehdev (KMDS Group) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0980.24.
 - The development proposed is a front boundary brick wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a front boundary brick wall at 1A The Sheilings, Havering, Hornchurch, RM11 2QD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0980.24, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates must be commenced not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan PL- 6216_11, Proposed Site Plan BR- 6216_13, Wall Elevation BR- 6216_14, Proposed Street Scene BR- 6216_15.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is on a short length of road, which has a character that is visually distinct from the main part of The Sheilings. This is due to a sharp bend in the road followed by a change in house styles along the remainder of the street. This short stretch of road incorporates runs of tall close board fencing and brick and railing boundary walls. It is also viewed partly within the context of the corner properties on Nelmes Crescent, due to the proximity with the road junction. Hence, while open aspects do feature further into The Sheilings, this is not the only feature of the road, and the presence of boundary treatments along its progression is notable.
4. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling set back behind a hard-surfaced front driveway. At present it does not have a front boundary treatment but given the immediate context, my observations were that this was not intrinsically important to the overall qualities of the street scene at this point. The appearance and

arrangement of the appeal property generally contributes towards the overall pleasant residential character of the area.

5. Whilst the site frontage is wide, the proposed boundary treatment incorporates good quality design features and materials that would break-up its massing, including brick piers, railings, and splayed entrances. The railings would also provide views towards the front of the dwelling, thereby retaining a degree of openness. Furthermore, the overall height reflects the prevailing character of the streetscape at this point. Hence the proposal would reinforce the prevailing pleasant residential character of the street scene and would not detract from the openness of the main part of The Sheilings. This would accord with the design principles within the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, adopted 2011.
6. It is highlighted that the neighbouring property, no 1 The Sheilings, has an open and pleasant character, in common with no's 4 and 6 The Sheilings. However, the appeal property differs as it has the only frontage that aligns with the run of taller boundary features that I have already identified. Notwithstanding the Council's concern that the boundary treatment directly opposite may have required planning permission, and that the corner properties on Nelmes Crescent should be discounted, they nevertheless form part of the context of the appeal site. On that basis, their presence is relevant to my consideration.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed front boundary wall would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (adopted November 2021), which requires new development to respect local character and distinctiveness through high quality design.

Conditions

I have imposed the standard time limit and list of approved plans conditions in the interests of certainty, and in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR