



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2025

by A Knight BA PG Dip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/W/24/3355466

Jobbers Rest, St. Marys Lane, Havering, Upminster RM14 3LT

- 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 Heartwood Inns against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0567.24.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side extension at Jobbers Rest, St. Marys Lane, Upminster RM14 3LT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0567.24, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the following approved plans: '101', '201', 'Email from Agent to Case Officer dated 04/09/2024'.
 - 3) The development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the materials detailed on the drawing '201' submitted with the application.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and on the Cranham Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within the CA, and includes a detached public house and its grounds. The statutory duty set out in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of a development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight be given to their conservation.
4. With reference to the CA Character Appraisal and Management Proposals document, whilst its heart comprises a group of historic buildings including the parish church and Cranham Hall, the CA also includes other, largely open land with occasional buildings thereupon. This includes the appeal site. For the

purposes of this appeal the significance of the CA is in the way individual buildings are spread across open country in a manner strikingly distinct from abutting suburban development.

5. The appeal site is in the northeastern corner of the CA. It includes a detached public house adjacent to the road, along with its car park and gardens. Though the site is neighboured by formal, suburban development to the north and west, it is appreciably at the eastern edge of Upminster, with land beyond largely comprising woods and fields. As such, the site adheres and contributes to the pertinent characteristics of the CA, in that it includes a building set in open country; The gap between the building and 46 Westbury Terrace, the nearest property to the west, is sufficient to create a sense of separation and distinction between the site and abutting suburban development.
6. The Council identifies the public house building itself (the building) as making a neutral contribution to the CA. I see no reason to disagree. It is of broadly traditional, but reasonably plain design and appearance. The main part of its front elevation incorporates some symmetry and balance but overall, the building is a mix of elements bearing little architectural relation to each other. Flat roofed elements are as characteristic of the building as pitched roof ones. Matching cream paint has been applied to areas of render, timber cladding, and brickwork to provide some consistency and coherence, but the varying shapes, forms, and finishes within the building remain sufficiently apparent as to form part of its character. The effect is not without charm.
7. The appeal scheme includes the erection of a single storey side extension on the western side of the building. The extension would be glazed in the main, with aluminium framework and composite cladding, painted cream to match other parts of the building. The extension would be only partially and indirectly visible from the public highway due to mature greenery at the site boundary but would be fully visible to users of the public house, and visible to differing extents from nearby properties.
8. The extension would leave a significant enough gap to the west that the building would remain visibly separate and distinct from nearby suburban development. As such, the site would continue to make a broadly similar, and no less beneficial, contribution to the CA. Flat roofs, as proposed in the extension, are a feature of the building already, as are varying forms, shapes, and materials. As such, the addition of a flat-roof element using aluminium frames and composite cladding would, given the intention to paint them a matching colour, be accommodated within the existing mixed look and feel of the building, causing neither harm nor significant change to its character or appearance.
9. I recognise that the building has been extended previously, but it nevertheless appears as a distinct, separate building outside of, and different to, nearby suburban development. It is not evident that any further extension or alterations would be bound to undermine that aspect of its character and appearance. As such, any proposal to extend it further can, at least at present, be assessed on its merits. This is the approach I have taken.
10. The proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the host building, and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would therefore satisfy the requirements of the Act, and of the Framework, and

also adhere to the pertinent requirements of Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies 26 and 28 of the Havering Local Plan (also 2021).

Other Matters

11. I observed a fabric pergola cover over a terrace on the western side of the building. The Council has cast doubt on the lawfulness of this. The description of development makes no reference to replacing an existing pergola, and whilst the plans refer to the fabric pergola, they do not show it. As such, I have attached no weight to the presence of the pergola in my determination.

Conditions

12. To meet legislative requirements, a condition is imposed regarding the period for commencement. Conditions specifying the relevant drawings and the external materials to be used in the development are necessary to provide certainty and to maintain the character and appearance of the host building and area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

A Knight

INSPECTOR