
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2025

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/24/3351772

6 Hacton Parade, Central Drive, Hornchurch, Havering, RM12 6EL

- 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 S Cetin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0731.24.
 - The development proposed is rear outbuilding (Storage) with fireproofing material.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Preliminary Matters

2. The outbuilding was erected on site prior to my site visit. I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area,
 - The effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in Hacton Parade with particular regard to noise

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The outbuilding is to the rear of a commercial parade with flats above. It faces onto a garage court providing parking for neighbouring properties and access to the commercial units. The setting includes functional elements such as the garage blocks, a prominent extractor flue and other outbuildings to the rear of neighbouring units.
5. Within this setting the outbuilding the subject of this appeal is a wooden structure with a monopitched roof set down from the level of the access road, directly to the rear of No 6 which currently operates as a takeaway. While this set down reduces the height and prominence of the building in the street scene, it is still a large structure of greater height and footprint than the neighbouring outbuildings.
6. The outbuilding would be finished in a fireproof metal finish. While precise details of its appearance have not been provided, a metallic finish when seen against the brick walls of the host building and surrounding houses, flats and garages would

appear incongruous. Given the size of the building it would be prominent in the setting, and out of keeping with the character of the area.

7. The access road is not a public road, so views of the site are somewhat restricted. However, it is in clear view from the surrounding properties and to users of the garages. There are outbuildings to the rear of neighbouring units, but these are smaller structures and in any case it is not clear that planning permission has been granted for them. The appellant has referred to other outbuildings either granted planning permission or retained without objection. However, no details of the siting, appearance or circumstances of these buildings have been provided. These considerations do not outweigh the harm arising from the size and proposed appearance of the structure.
8. The appeal proposal would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area so conflicts with policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan (the Local Plan) and policy D4 of the London Plan. Taken together these seek that development be of a high architectural quality and design and respect and complement the distinctive qualities and character of the site and local area.

Noise

9. The outbuilding occupies much of the yard to the rear of the host property. There is little separation distance between the commercial unit and the outbuilding, or to its sides. No evidence has been provided over how the yard was used before the outbuilding was constructed, but there is nothing to indicate that it was not used for servicing the takeaway.
10. An interested party has reported noise arising from the use of the yard and the premises in general. However, this does not directly relate to the outbuilding. The rear yard is directly associated with the property, and the presence of a storage building within it used in association with the takeaway need not necessarily result in an increase in noise. The council have suggested that the presence of the outbuilding would contribute to an intensification of activity within the rear yard. However, no evidence has been provided of this.
11. Had I otherwise been minded to allow the appeal I would have considered suitably worded conditions to control any noise originating from the use of the outbuilding. However, as I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds it is not necessary to consider this further.
12. In principle, therefore, the presence and use of the outbuilding would not result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to occupiers of Hacton Parade. It would therefore accord with policies 7 and 34 of the Local Plan, and policy D14 of the London Plan. Taken together these policies require that development not result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance.
13. The council also referred to policy 33 of the Local Plan and SI 1 of the London Plan. These policies relate to air quality, so are not determinative in my consideration of this issue.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

14. The appeal proposal would support the existing takeaway by providing secure storage. This is a benefit that weighs in favour of the development. However, it attracts limited weight as it is not clear that a similar benefit could not be secured

by an outbuilding of more sympathetic design. In this instance, the benefit would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area arising from the size and appearance of the outbuilding.

15. The proposal therefore conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations to indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Consequently, the appeal is dismissed.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR