



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 April 2025

by **C Housden BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th of May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/24/3353717

6 Abbots Court, Queens Park Road, Romford, Havering RM3 0NX

- 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 Harry Dupay against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application ref is P0766.24.
 - The development proposed is part single, part two storey side/rear extension for the creation of one 2xbed dwelling with parking and amenities and extension to an existing vehicular crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development differs between the application form and the decision notice. As the appellant has used the wording of the decision notice in their appeal form, in the interests of clarity, I have used this description of development in the banner heading.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - The effect of the appeal proposal on highway safety, with specific regard to the provision of on-street parking along Queens Park Road; and
 - The effect of the two storey element of the appeal proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of 1 Queens Park Road, with specific regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Queens Park Road predominantly comprises two storey properties arranged in short terraces and in pairs of semi-detached houses with common architectural features, set in a regular pattern along a mostly linear building line. Gaps between the buildings are commonplace, with driveways usually separating buildings from one another. In some instances, single storey side extensions have been built, however gaps above the ground floor between the buildings remains a prevalent feature.

5. Abbots Court comprises a large two storey flatted building situated at the junction of Queens Park Road with Avenue Road. As seen with many of the other plots within the street, the appeal site is separated from its adjacent neighbour at 1 Queens Park Road (No 1) by a driveway which leaves a perceptible gap between the buildings.
6. The appeal proposal would extend two-storey built form across the driveway close to the shared boundary with No 1. The appellant suggests that the development would complete the frontage along Queens Park Road. However, I find that the introduction of the appeal proposal would substantially diminish the gap between Abbots Court and No 1 to an extent that would be detrimental to the established pattern of development. As a result, the proposed two storey property would appear as overdevelopment of the plot and incongruous with the surrounding development. As such, the appeal proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.
7. The appeal proposal would therefore conflict with Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan (HLP). These policies seek to ensure that development is of a high-quality design that contributes to the creation of successful places within Havering, amongst other things.

Parking

8. The appeal proposal would involve the extension of the existing vehicle crossover to facilitate the creation of two additional on-site car parking spaces. However, the crossover would require the removal of up to three marked resident parking spaces situated on Queens Park Road.
9. I have not been presented with detailed access drawings regarding the extension of the crossover, and as such, I cannot be certain exactly how many of the on-street parking spaces would need to be removed to facilitate the appeal proposal. I do not have any convincing evidence before me to demonstrate that the appeal proposal would not result in the loss of all three parking spaces.
10. Furthermore, whilst the appeal proposal would increase the number of private off-street parking spaces from six spaces to seven spaces, an additional dwelling would also be created, which would utilise the additional parking space. The appeal proposal, therefore, would not result in a surplus of parking spaces to compensate for the loss of the on-street spaces.
11. The appeal scheme would therefore result in a decrease in on-street spaces which serve residents of the area, and I do not have evidence before me demonstrating the local area has sufficient capacity to accommodate the loss of parking spaces without causing unacceptable harm to highway safety.
12. As such, I cannot conclude that the loss of the on-street parking spaces would have an acceptable impact on the surrounding highway network and not result in material harm to the safety of other road users and pedestrians. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal proposal would conflict with Policy 24 of the HLP and Policy T6 of the London Plan (2021) (LP). These policies seek to ensure that, where there is a net loss of parking spaces, it is robustly demonstrated that there is no need for the spaces that are lost.

Living conditions

13. The majority of the two storey element of the proposal would be situated adjacent to the side elevation and side path of No 1. Whilst I note that the two-storey element would exceed past the rear building line of No 1, it would only do so marginally. The rear elevation and garden of the neighbouring property would not be enclosed by the appeal proposal or result in an overbearing impact that would harmfully affect their outlook. As such the living conditions of the occupiers of No 1 would be satisfactorily maintained.
14. The development would therefore comply with Policy 7 of the HLP in this regard. This policy, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that the living conditions and quality of life of existing residents are not adversely impacted by development.

Other Matters

15. I note that a neighbour has highlighted that the appeal site as it currently exists is subject to people parking without permission and blocking the pavement, and an area where people occasionally drop rubbish. Whilst the appeal proposal may resolve these issues raised by the neighbour, this does not diminish the harms that I have identified.
16. The appeal proposal would deliver an additional dwelling within a sustainable location. This derives support from the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) at paragraph 61 which sets out the Government's objective to significantly boosting the supply of homes.
17. I also note, the Framework at paragraph 73 highlights the importance of small and medium sites in making an important contribution to meeting the housing requirements of the area. The appellant further identifies this approach is also advocated through the LP.
18. The appeal proposal would also generate short term economic benefits through the construction of the appeal proposal, and longer-term economic benefits to local shops and services through the introduction of an additional household into the area, which draws support from section 6 of the Framework.
19. The evidence before me shows that the development would create a property which would have good quality living conditions for future occupiers. This derives support from paragraph 135(f) of the Framework.
20. Whilst these matters weigh in favour of the development, given the appeal proposal would make a small contribution of a single dwelling, the benefits in this instance would be limited.

Planning Balance

21. It is common ground that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, with the Council's officer report setting out an uncontested position of 3.4 years. The parties also agree that the Council has achieved under 75% in the Housing Delivery Test, which is described by the Framework at footnote 8 as substantially below the housing requirement. As such, the provisions of paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the Framework are engaged.
22. As described above, the benefits associated with a single dwelling would be limited, even when taking account of the objective of significantly boosting the supply of

housing, the Council's five year housing land supply position and housing delivery test score.

23. In my assessment, I have found that the appeal proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and does not satisfactorily demonstrate that the loss of on-street parking spaces would not have a harmful effect on the safety of future road users and pedestrians. The importance of achieving well designed development is a key aspect of sustainable development, which is highlighted by paragraph 135 of the Framework. It is also clear at paragraph 139 that development which is not well designed should be refused. I also note that whilst paragraph 124 of the Framework seeks to make effective use of land, this is to be achieved whilst also safeguarding and improving the environment. Paragraph 129(d) also emphasises the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character.
24. Paragraph 109 of the Framework seeks to ensure that patterns of movement and parking are integral to the design of schemes, and this contributes to the making of high-quality places. Paragraph 116 sets out that development should be refused if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.
25. Therefore, the conflict between the appeal proposal and Policies 7, 24 and 26 of the HLP and T6 of the LP should be given significant weight against the scheme. I find that the appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole.
26. As such, I conclude that the adverse effects of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole. Therefore, in this case, the presumption in favour of sustainable development would not apply.

Conclusion

27. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Housden

INSPECTOR