



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/24/3350594

79 Primrose Glen, Hornchurch, Havering RM11 2NL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0672.24.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and erection of a 2-storey, 1-bedroom dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - Whether the proposed development would provide sufficient living conditions for future occupiers with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site relates to No 79 Primrose Glen (No 79), a 2-storey end of terrace house with a single storey garage and rear extension. The surrounding area is residential and is largely characterised by two storey terraced properties.
4. No 79 occupies a prominent end of terrace plot which is clearly visible from surrounding public vantage points including when entering Primrose Glen from Birch Crescent in a westerly direction. The surrounding properties are generally set back from the road within narrow plots and there is a level of uniformity to dwellings for the greater part in terms of size and scale. Garden areas and off-street parking are largely located to the front with gardens to the rear. All these aspects combine to give a clear and consistent pattern of development.
5. The host property benefits from private amenity space to the front, side and rear. The proposed development seeks planning permission for a two storey, one bedroomed dwelling with associated amenity space, including the demolition of the existing garage. The subdivision of the plot to accommodate the proposed dwelling would leave an awkward angled shape and small plot for the proposed development. The shape and size of the plot would mean that the proposed

dwelling would need to occupy a substantial section of the site leaving only small and contrived areas for amenity space. As a result, the overall positioning and siting of the dwelling would sit right up to the side boundary. This would result in a cramped form of development appearing as inconsistent with the established pattern of development where there is a more coherent arrangement of space associated with the existing dwellings in the locality.

6. The dwelling would be highly visible when entering Primrose Glen from Birch Crescent and a dwelling in this location would appear incongruous and visually intrusive in the street scene appearing bulky and prominent in comparison to other properties. The uncharacteristic small plot, together with its overall scale and roof design fail to integrate with the prevailing scale and roof designs of the adjoining properties which further contributes to visual intrusiveness and would erode the existing pattern of development. In coming to such conclusions, I have had due regard to the front and rear building lines but cannot agree that such is in keeping with the existing built form or that the development would add visual interest to the street scene.
7. For the above reasons, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies 7, 10 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031, 2021 (HLP) which together, amongst other matters, requires development proposals to respect, reinforce and complement the local street scene. For the same reasons, the proposed development would also be contrary to section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) relating to achieving well designed places.

Living conditions

8. The limited size and contrived shape of the plot including its constrained garden area means that the living area to the rear of the proposed dwelling which is the main habitable room would have very poor outlook onto the enclosed small garden. It would be enclosed by the extension wall on one side and boundary fence on the other which would be in very close quarters to the windows to the rear. This minimal separation distance from the main living space to its boundaries would result in poor outlook for future occupiers who would feel a significant sense of enclosure to the detriment of the use of their living space.
9. The proposed development may meet the internal area requirements and provide for sufficient levels of natural light and ventilation whilst also providing adequate provision of outdoor space, but this would not alter my findings in relation to outlook for future occupiers as this would still be substandard. I appreciate that outlook can vary in urban environments and note other areas of outlook for the property. However, in considering this scheme based on its own merits, I find that the outlook from the main living area onto the small, enclosed garden would be such that it would adversely impact the living conditions of future occupiers.
10. For the above reasons, the proposed development would not provide suitable living conditions for future occupiers of the proposed development with particular regard to outlook. It would therefore be contrary to Policies 7, 10 and 26 of the HLP and Policy D6 of the London Plan, 2021 which together, amongst other matters, ensures that the amenity and quality of life of existing and future residents is not adversely impacted.

Other Matters

11. I am aware of the proximity of the site to services and facilities and note the appellant's comments regarding efficient use of land, accessibility, energy efficiency, biodiversity and transport matters. However, this would not alter my findings in relation to the above main issues.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

12. I have found that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would also not provide suitable living conditions for future occupiers of the proposed development with particular regard to outlook. I attribute significant weight to such matters.
13. The Council accept that at present they are only able to demonstrate a housing land supply of 3.4 years and therefore cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Consequently, because of the provisions of footnote 8, paragraph 11d)ii of the Framework should be applied. This states that 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.
14. Set against the harm identified, there would be some minor economic benefit through employment during the construction period and some minor economic and social contribution to the local community from a new dwelling. However, the extent to which these are beneficial is limited by the small-scale nature of the development with the modest contribution of one dwelling only making a small difference to the overall supply of housing. Consequently, these benefits attract modest weight.
15. For the above reasons, the adverse impacts in respect of the main issues would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.
16. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR