

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

APPEAL DECISIONS - PLANNING					
Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P1066.14 Ingrebourne Hill Rainham Road Rainham <i>Engineering earthworks to merge Ingrebourne Hill with Hornchurch Country Park using inert soils, including temporary soils treatment and recovery, internal haul road, ancillary buildings, overnight security and structures to provide a managed woodland area with recreational and amenity after use.</i></p>	<p>Local Inquiry</p>	<p>Approved with Agreement</p>	<p>Committee</p>	<p>The proposal would give rise to noise, dust, and other disturbances that would result in a significant adverse impact on wildlife and the adjacent Ingrebourne Marshes SSSI. In this respect the proposal is contrary to Policy DC58 of the Development Control Policies DPD and policies within the NPPF.</p> <p>The proposal would, during the construction phase and following the completion of the development, result in significant harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the harm, by reason of inappropriateness and other harm, have not been demonstrated in this case. In this respect, the proposal is contrary to Policy DC45 of the Development Control Policies DPD, Policy 7.16 of the London Plan and policies within the NPPF.</p> <p>The proposal would be significantly harmful to the amenities of local residents owing to dust nuisance, noise, visual impact, and reduced air quality during the construction phase of the development, contrary to Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposal, by reason of the high number of HGV movements proposed each day during the construction period, would result in congestion on the local road network, causing inconvenience to road users and pedestrians, contrary to</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The Council reviewed its case after receiving further information and concluded that, subject to the imposition of relevant conditions, its concerns relating to the ecological impacts on the Ingrebourne Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and harm to residential amenity, relating to noise, air quality and dust, would not be sufficiently adverse to continue to warrant refusal of the application. The Council also accepted that any adverse highway impacts of the proposal would not be at a level that could substantiate a reason for refusal but it nevertheless maintained that there would be some harm on these grounds.</p> <p>The main issue in this case is whether there are any material considerations that outweigh the harm caused by inappropriate development within the Green Belt, and any other harm, and are sufficient to justify the proposal on the grounds of very special circumstances. It was agreed by both parties that the works would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the site as existing could not be classified as an eyesore, nor was it neglected or derelict, and thus there was no justification for the project similar to that used to support the creation of Ingrebourne Hill. The site was judged to be unremarkable however it was not unpleasant, nor did it appear to need further work and there was no pressing need, in my view, to carry out the remodelling on the scale</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				Policy DC32 of the Development Control Policies DPD	<p>proposed.</p> <p>The landscaping benefits of the proposal would take a number of years to be fully realised and would, in the view of the Inspector be limited. Although the proposal would create better drainage of the site provided through the establishment of drainage ditches and a pond, there was little evidence that the site has had any significant flooding problems. In terms of providing the additional woodland sought by the Forestry Commission, the amount of imported material would not be excessive however the Inspector was not persuaded that the proposed landform was the only way the objectives of improving the quality of the land restoration and the links between the Hill and the Country Park could be achieved.</p> <p>In summary, the quality of the land restoration would be improved to a certain extent, however any other benefits of the scheme would not be particularly weighty. There would be harm to the openness of the Green Belt during the construction period and beyond and the scarring of the land would take further time to naturalise and return to the 'open countryside' appearance. Until the planting scheme has settled and matured, the site would appear as a man-made landscape which, would also harm Green Belt openness and amount to encroachment into the countryside. The increased- traffic during construction would have a detrimental impact on amenity. The factors contributing to the Green Belt harm caused by the proposal,</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					both temporary and permanent, were accorded substantial weight. When considering the benefits of the scheme, these were found to be limited and that there was nothing that, either individually or cumulatively, would outweigh the harm identified.
<p>P1667.15 St Georges House 2 Eastern Road Romford <i>Variation of condition 5 of planning permission P0897.13 to change the permitted opening hours to 21:00-03:00 on Sunday to Wednesday and 21:00-05:00 on Thursday to Saturday - RETROSPECTIVE</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The extended operating hours would result in a greater level of noise and general disturbance later at night and during the early morning, which would be seriously prejudicial to the amenity of adjacent occupiers and of the surrounding area in general. The proposal also gives rise to concern over the potential for a material increase in disorder, anti-social behaviour and other community safety issues in this location. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies DC23, DC55, DC61 and DC63 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document..	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> The Inspector agreed with the Council and considered the subject condition was necessary and reasonable, having regard to the living conditions of neighbouring residents in terms of noise, disturbance and anti-social behaviour.
<p>Y0293.15 4 The Ridgeway Romford <i>Single storey rear extension with an overall depth of 6 metres from the original rear wall of the dwelling house, a maximum height of 3 metres and an eaves height 2.9 metres</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse Prior Approval	Delegated	The Council consider that the impact of the proposed development would unacceptably harm the amenity of adjacent neighbours at No. 2 and No.4 The Ridgeway, Romford by reason of loss of light and privacy, outlook and overbearing effect on the adjacent properties. This written notice indicates that the proposed development would not comply with condition A.4 of Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A of the Town and Country	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed with Conditions</p> The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of surrounding properties, with particular regard to both immediate neighbours in respect of outlook, sunlight and daylight, and loss of privacy and that the proposal fell within the definition of permitted development, for which prior approval could be granted.

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. It is important to note that this written notice does not indicate whether or not the proposed development would comply with any of the other limitations of conditions of Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A.</p> <p>The applicant has the right to an appeal against this notice to the Planning Inspectorate, see details below.</p>	
<p>D0328.15 13 Hardley Crescent Hornchurch <i>Certificate of lawfulness for loft conversion (Retrospective)</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development fails to accord with the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 and a Certificate of Lawfulness is denied in this instance.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed</p> <p>The main issue was whether the Council's decision to refuse to grant a LDC was well-founded. The Council based their decision on their calculation that the cubic content of the resulting roof space exceeded the threshold in Class B. The Appellant argued that the correct volume was less than 50 cubic metres. The Inspector stated that the difference in the volume calculations turned on whether the correct measurement is from the ceiling or the external guttering. The relevant legislation, the GPDO did not provide any assistance in defining 'roof space' for these purposes neither did Technical Guidance published by the DCLG. The Inspector considered the appellant's interpretation to be correct. The appeal was allowed and an LDC was issued.</p> <p>The Council disagreed with this decision and has challenged it. An appeal has been lodged at the Royal Courts of Justice, Queens Bench Division Planning Court.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P1241.15 Pinewoods St Johns Road Romford <i>Demolition of the existing building, Erection of three storey apartment blocks with room accommodation comprising 32 no. self contained apartments, layout 32 parking spaces and associated landscaping and amenity space.</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of insufficient on-site parking provision, result in unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity and contrary to Policies DC2 and DC33 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions The Council considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable overspill onto adjoining roads due to the limited availability of on-street parking within the immediate vicinity. The Highways Authority objected to the proposal. The Inspector stated that there was no evidence presented that existing on-street parking was causing harm to highway safety and was satisfied that any over-spill parking of on-street parking could be accommodated without detriment to highway safety. On the issue of the education contribution, the Inspector was satisfied that it met the tests set out in CIL Regulations and NPPF.</p>
<p>P0896.15 The Moorings Southend Arterial Road Hornchurch <i>To extend existing planning permission for display of timber buildings and storage prior to delivery to customers</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The site is within the area identified in the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document as Metropolitan Green Belt. The Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document states that in order to achieve the purposes of the Metropolitan Green Belt it is essential to retain and protect the existing rural character of the area so allocated and new development, including changes of use, will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, development involving change of use of the land is inappropriate development. The continued use as proposed has a</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions The Inspector judged that the location of the majority of the timber sheds underneath the canopy and within the curtilage of the site together with the temporary nature of the proposal meant that the harm to the openness of the Green Belt was limited. There would also be conflict with one of the Green Belt purposes. It followed that the proposal is inappropriate development. Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Set against this were the substantial benefits identified in terms of retaining a previously</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>adverse impact on the openness and character of this Green Belt site. Since the granting of temporary planning permission, or as part of this application, no suitable improvements to landscaping, boundary treatment, and appearance of the permanent buildings been carried out or proposed and as such there are insufficient very special circumstances to outweigh the in principle harm through inappropriateness. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DC45 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the NPPF.</p>	<p>developed, partially derelict site in use; the opportunity to secure visual improvements to the site through additional landscaping and the contribution which the proposal makes to the local economy.</p> <p>The substantial weight given to the harm arising from inappropriate development and its effect on the openness of the Green Belt was outweighed by the weight given to the totality of economic and environmental benefits of the proposal. Consequently, the very special circumstances existed to justify the development.</p>
<p>P1017.15 1 Pontypool Walk Romford <i>New 2 bedroom house</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate on site car parking provision for the donor property, result in unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity and is thereby contrary to Policy DC2 and DC33 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate provision of amenity space, result in a cramped over-development of the site to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers, contrary to the provisions of Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The proposal would not provide acceptable living conditions for future occupants, with particular reference to amenity space. There was no evidence to demonstrate that the lack of off street parking provision required would lead to severe impacts on highway grounds. Given the findings on the first issue, it was not necessary to consider the matter of the education contribution.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policy DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.	
<p>P1255.15 1-15 Corbets Tey Road Upminster <i>Creation of a third floor roof extension incorporating 4 no. flats, together with the associated extension/alteration of the existing communal stairwells and renovation of the building exterior.</i></p>	Written Reps	Approved with Agreement	Committee	<p>The proposed extension would by reason of its incongruous design, appearance and position cause material harm to the building's distinctive Art Deco architectural form and integrity and would thereby harm the character and appearance of the streetscene contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The complete absence of on site parking for the new units would create increased vehicular demands on the adjacent access road and the site's vicinity materially harmful to amenity and safety contrary to Policies DC32 and DC33 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposal by reason of the number of new units, their relationship to existing flats within the block, the limited amount of amenity provision and lack of car parking provision represents an overdevelopment of the site harmful to the character of the area and amenity of neighbouring residents contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The design of the proposal is intended to give it the appearance of a modern addition to the art-deco style appeal building. The Inspector concluded that due to its contrasting design and its scale and its location on top of the host building, the proposal would appear as an unduly dominant feature. A UU was submitted to address the Council's concerns about parking and highway safety. It was concluded that there would be no harm in relation to the living conditions of future occupants as amenity space would be useable and of a good quality. This did not outweigh the harm identified in relation to the character and appearance of the host building</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.	
<p>P1257.15 17-31 Corbets Tey Road Upminster <i>Creation of a third floor roof extension incorporating 4 no. flats, together with the associated extension/alteration of the existing communal stairwells and renovation of the building exterior.</i></p>	Written Reps	Approved with Agreement	Committee	<p>The proposed extension would by reason of its incongruous design, appearance and position cause material harm to the building's distinctive Art Deco architectural form and integrity and would thereby harm the character and appearance of the streetscene contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The complete absence of on site parking for the new units would create increased vehicular demands on the adjacent access road and the site's vicinity materially harmful to amenity and safety contrary to Policies DC32 and DC33 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposal by reason of the number of new units, their relationship to existing flats within the block, the limited amount of amenity provision and absence of car parking provision represents an overdevelopment of the site harmful to the character of the area and amenity of neighbouring residents contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The design of the proposal is intended to give it the appearance of a modern addition to the art-deco style appeal building. The Inspector concluded that due to its contrasting design and its scale and its location on top of the host building, the proposal would appear as an unduly dominant feature.</p> <p>A UU was submitted to address the Council's concerns about parking and highway safety. It was concluded that there would be no harm in relation to the living conditions of future occupants as amenity space would be useable and of a good quality. This did not outweigh the harm identified in relation to the character and appearance of the host building.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.	
<p>P1668.15 The Ockendon Kennels Ockendon Road North Ockendon <i>Redevelopment of the existing grey hound track and kennels with the construction of 22No. new dwellings.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>Owing to the heights of the proposed buildings, the intensity of the proposal's layout, and the extent of development compared to the existing built development, it is considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt and be contrary to the purposes of including land within it. The proposal is considered to constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and would also be harmful to the visual amenities of the Green Belt and the surrounding area. Very special circumstances that overcome the harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness and visual impact, have not been demonstrated in this case. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 7.16 of the London Plan and Policies DC45 and DC61 of the Development Control Policies DPD .</p> <p>In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal scheme would reduce the openness of the Green Belt and would unacceptably urbanise the site, failing to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. It would amount to inappropriate development and would be contrary to the NPPF in several respects. The Inspector also found that the proposal would harm the setting of the North Ockendon CA.</p> <p>It was accepted that the provision of 22 dwellings on brownfield land would provide much needed housing accommodation, particularly as there is no up-to-date five year housing land supply but given the harm identified, these benefits would not outweigh that harm.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.	
<p>P1653.15 3-7 Billet Lane Hornchurch <i>Alteration to the front seating area at ground floor level in order to provide sliding panels around the existing decking area.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed seating enclosure, by reason of its scale, depth and design would result in an overbearing and unduly prominent feature in the street scene, visually intrusive and out of character with its surroundings, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal proposal due to its design, scale, materials and siting appears unduly prominent feature which is out of character with the street scene and surrounding area.</p>
<p>P0178.16 92 North Street Hornchurch <i>First floor rear extension to create a new studio flat unit</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate on site car parking provision, result in unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity and therefore contrary to Policy DC33 of the LDF Core Strategy.</p> <p>The proposed first floor rear extension would, by reason of its excessive depth, height, roof design and position close to the boundaries of the site, represent intrusive and unneighbourly development as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector agreed with the Council in regard to all the main issues concerning, character and appearance; highway safety; living conditions and that a contribution towards education provision was justified.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.	
<p>P0030.16 2 Netherpark Drive Romford <i>Proposed demolition of existing dwelling and replacement with 2 x 3 bedroom chalets with associated amenity</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its design, layout and orientation, result in development which does not appropriately respond to the building forms and patterns of development in the surrounding area and would thereby have an inappropriate and unacceptable appearance in the street scene which would neither maintain or enhance the special character of the Gidea Park Special Character Area contrary to Policy DC61 and DC69 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The education contribution sought would meet the relevant tests set out in the NPPF and CIL Regulations. The Inspector determined that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area however this did not outweigh the harm that identified in regard to the lack of the education contribution.</p>
<p>P0297.16 11 Risebridge Road Gidea Park Romford <i>Demolition of detached garage and erection of a single storey rear extension & front porch.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its excessive scale, design and appearance, result in unsympathetic, visually intrusive development which would not preserve or enhance the special character of this part of the Gidea Park Conservation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The proposed extension would be subservient to the host property and the use of matching materials would allow suitable integration with the main dwelling. The Inspector concluded that proposal would represent an acceptable low key addition that</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Area contrary to the Core Strategy Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policies DC61 and DC68 and the Heritage Supplementary Planning Document. The proposed single storey rear extension would, by reason of its excessive depth, height and position close to the boundaries of the site, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	<p>would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</p>
<p>P0275.16 51 Acacia Avenue Hornchurch <i>Two storey side and rear extensions</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed first floor rear extension would, by reason of its excessive scale, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature to the property and adjoining terrace, harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to the Residential Extension and Alteration Supplementary Planning Document and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The width and bulk of the proposed rear first floor extension would overwhelm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The proposal would appear unacceptably dominant in the rear garden environment and larger in scale and bulk than neighbouring rear extensions.</p> <p>An application for an award of costs against the Council was refused. The Council provided a clear explanation of its reasons for refusal, with reasonable planning grounds, and therefore its behaviour was not unreasonable.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P1154.15 Crown Public House London Road Romford <i>Change of Use from A4 (drinking establishment) to C3 (dwelling houses). Part demolition of existing public house and new construction to provide 24 No. apartments</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Approved with Agreement</p>	<p>Committee</p>	<p>The proposal, by reason of the insufficient provision of on-site parking, would result in increased parking congestion thereby having a detrimental impact on amenity within the local area, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC32, DC33 and DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. The proposal, would give rise to a cramped, excessively dense development of the site, which would give rise to conditions that are detrimental to the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed development, contrary to the provisions of Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.</p> <p>In the absence of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution towards affordable housing, the proposal would fail to accord with Policy DC6 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>In the absence of a legal agreement to secure a contribution towards the</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>It was noted that the site had a low PTAL rating and provision of parking was below the DC2 standards. The Inspector however concluded that there would not be an unacceptable degree of increase in parking congestion or overspill of parking arising from the development onto surrounding streets.</p> <p>In terms of character and appearance, the proposal would not read as an unacceptable anomaly in terms of density. Nor would it be incongruous in terms of scale or bulk. Future occupiers of the proposal's apartments would not experience unacceptable overlooking or lack of privacy. Finally the contributions which would be made by the planning obligation in relation education and affordable housing would meet the relevant legislative tests.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				improvement of cycling routes between the development and Romford Town Centre the proposal would fail to improve the local cycling network and mitigate against the shortfall in on site parking provisions, to the detriment of the road network.	
<p>P0392.16 5 Crossways Romford <i>Two-storey side extension and loft conversion with 2no. rear dormers.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed two-storey extension would, by reason of its excessive bulk, scale, and positioning close to the boundary, result in an unsympathetic, overbearing and visually intrusive form of development which would overwhelm the original house and serve to close down the characteristic spacing between the neighbouring property at No.7 Crossways. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the special character of this part of the Gidea Park Conservation Area contrary to the Core Strategy Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policies DC61 and DC68 and the Heritage Supplementary Planning Document.	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal proposal would have a "terracing" and dominating impact which would unacceptably detract from the spacious and distinctive gaps between existing dwellings in the street. The proposal would not be a subordinate and sympathetic addition to the original house and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA.</p>
<p>P0374.16 1 Grange Road Romford <i>Proposed ground floor side & rear extension and basement extension</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed rear extension would, by reason of its excessive depth, height and position close to the boundaries of the site, result in a development that is unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive when viewed in the rear garden environment and from the wider streetscene contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The proposed development would, by	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The bulk and excessive depth of the proposal, together with the extent of site coverage would result in the proposal appearing as an excessively disproportionate addition to the host property.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				reason of its position and proximity to neighbouring properties cause overlooking and loss of privacy which would have a serious and adverse effect on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.	
<p>P1850.15 39 Ellis Avenue Rainham</p> <p><i>Single/two storey side extension to form a new dwelling</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its height, bulk and mass, as well as the proximity to the boundary of the site, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The proposal would not have a harmful or overbearing effect on its surroundings and it would integrate satisfactorily with the existing form. The requirement for a contribution towards education infrastructure met the three tests for planning obligations set out in the CIL Regulations. The appellant provided an executed planning obligation by means of a Unilateral Undertaking to comply with this requirement.</p>
<p>P1390.15 1-3 Station Road Harold Wood Romford</p> <p><i>Demolition of existing building and erection of new block comprising 3no. retail units and 6no. two-bedroom flats.</i></p>	Written Reps	Approved with Agreement	Committee	The proposal would, by reason of its overdeveloped scale of development and complete absence of on site car parking, fail to cater for the reasonable needs of future occupiers and would materially worsen parking conditions and congestion in the locality to the detriment of amenity. The resultant harm cannot	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the proposal would not provide appropriate living conditions for future occupants, with particular regard to provision of outdoor space. The absence of on-site parking within the proposal would not have a harmful effect on parking conditions and congestion. The</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>be reasonably mitigated by withholding parking permits as no Controlled Parking Zone currently exists in the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DC61 and DC33 of the Local Development Framework Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposal would, by reason of its cramped overdevelopment of the site, fail to provide sufficient amenity space to reasonably meet the needs of future occupants of the development, to the detriment of residential amenity and contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.</p>	<p>requirement for a planning obligation to secure a contribution towards education facilities met the relevant tests however a submitted UU was not properly executed and Council would not have been able to rely upon it to secure the contribution.</p> <p>An application for costs was made against the Council of the London Borough of Havering. The application was partially allowed as unnecessary cost had been borne by the applicant in having to address reason one. The issue of the CPZ, its inclusion in the reason for refusal and the lack of objective analysis or factual evidence amounted to unreasonable behaviour.</p>
<p>P0963.15 67 Main Road (Churchill House) Romford <i>Change of use of the first and second floors of the existing building and the erection of part three-storey, two-storey and single storey extensions to the side and rear to</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its design and appearance and its scale, height, bulk and mass, appear as an incongruous and unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature, resulting in an unsympathetic, visually intrusive development which would not preserve or enhance the special character of this part of the Gidea Park Conservation Area contrary to Policies DC61 and</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The proposed extensions would not be subordinate to the existing building and by introducing incompatible design features would harm its appearance, and thus fail to preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area. The proposal would fail to provide suitable outdoor amenity space for future occupants and sufficient parking provision for the residents and social club.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<i>create 9no. self-contained flats with associated car parking.</i>				<p>DC68 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The proposed development makes inadequate provision of suitable amenity space for perspective residential occupiers. In this respect, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The proposal would not provide adequate levels of off-street parking for the proposed residential units and retained social club use resulting in increased pressure for on-street parking in the vicinity of the site, inconveniencing existing residents/businesses and adversely affecting highway safety. In this respect, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DC33 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.</p>	<p>Finally the requirement for a planning obligation to secure a contribution towards education facilities met the relevant tests however a UU was not submitted so the proposal failed on this issue.</p>
<p>P0033.16 6 Hamilton Drive Romford</p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed row of houses to the rear of the site would, by reason of their prominent rear garden location, height, bulk and mass, appear as an</p>	<p>Dismissed The Inspector agreed with the conclusions of the Council on the matters of character &</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p><i>The demolition of the existing pair of semi-detached houses (No.s 2 & 4 Hamilton Drive), and garages and the erection of 6no. three-bedroom houses.</i></p>				<p>incongruous and unacceptably dominant, overbearing and visually intrusive features in the rear garden setting which would be harmful to the open appearance of the surrounding area and to the amenity of adjacent occupiers contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposed row of houses to the rear of the site would, by reason of their layout and servicing arrangements, result in an unsatisfactory relationship with the proposed dwellings to the front of the site, the wider site boundary and overall setting within the plot, leading to a cramped over-development of the site contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.</p>	<p>appearance and living conditions and that the proposal made adequate provision for local infrastructure within the area</p>
<p>P0027.16 2A Smart Close Romford</p> <p><i>Retention of loft conversion with reduced size rear dormer</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The rear dormer would, by reason of its height, bulk and mass, be harmful to the visual amenities of neighbouring occupiers and appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the rear garden environment/streetscene. The</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the proposal would appear as a large and dominant feature within the rear roof slope of the dwelling. It would show little respect for the scale and form of the original building and</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				development is therefore harmful to the appearance and character of the surrounding area and is contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.	would appear highly visible within the street scene.
<p>P0450.16 450 Wingletye lane Hornchurch <i>Proposed first floor side extension and loft conversion to include rear dormer</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The development would, by reason of the position of the first floor side extension on the boundary with the public highway and the cumulative impact of the first floor side extension and large rear dormer window would, by its scale, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature, harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The scheme showed little respect for the scale and form of the original building and would appear highly visible within the street scene. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and this decision was reached having regard to the long-term visual impact of the development in the wider public interest.</p>
<p>P1006.15 Matthews Close Harold Wood <i>Construction of a 3 storey side extension and creation of 3 x 1 bedroom units.</i></p>	Written Reps	Approved with Agreement	Committee	The proposal by reason of the excessive density, overbearing built form and insufficient amenity space, would result in a harmful overdevelopment of the site, detrimental to the locality and contrary to the provisions of Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. The proposal would give rise to an adverse impact on the outlook and amenity of occupiers of neighbouring residents in Matthews Close, contrary to the provisions of Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. The proposals, by reason of the loss of trees from the site, in particular the	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The proposal failed to ensure that appropriate outdoor amenity space would be available for existing and future residents of dwellings on the site. The loss of the TPO would detract further from the quality of the communal garden for a considerable number of years. Giving the proximity of the proposal to 3 and 4 Matthews Close, the scheme would materially harm the living conditions of the occupants of these flats. Giving the findings on the other matters, the issue of education contribution was not pursued.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>preserved sycamore tree (T1), would have a detrimental impact on visual amenity, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC60 and DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.</p>	
<p>P0575.16 37 and 39 St Georges Avenue Hornchurch <i>Demolition of existing outbuilding / garage (number 39) and construction of 2 detached bungalows with private amenity and off street car parking fronting Beverley Close, Hornchurch.</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its scale, bulk, design and proximity to the boundaries of the site, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the currently spacious rear garden environment and the streetscene harmful to the character and appearance of the Emerson Park area, the wider streetscene and the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring property, contrary to Policies DC61 and DC69 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate on site car parking provision, result in unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity and contrary to Policy DC33 and DC34 of the LDF Core</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The proposal would introduce two dwellings in a section of road not characterised by residential development. The mass and bulk of the buildings would appear as isolated and uncharacteristic features at odds with the spacious and open feel to the area. On the highways issue, the site has a very low PTAL rating and given the nature of the road and in the absence of reliable evidence to the contrary it was not demonstrated that a reduction in car parking standards could be justified.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposed development would, due to a lack of provision of visibility splays, result in development that would be unsafe for road users and will compromise highway safety contrary to Policy DC33 and DC34 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.</p>	
<p>P1062.15 King Harold 51 Station Road Harold Wood Romford <i>Raised roof extension to provide 4 additional flats</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development, by reason of the bulk of the proposed development, particularly at roof level, including the raised eaves detail and vertical tiling, would give rise to a top heavy development, harmful to the scale and proportions of the existing building, which would appear incongruous and visually intrusive harmful to the character and appearance of the building and to the character of the wider streetscene, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposed layout of the development would be inadequate resulting in substandard accommodation for future</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The height and scale of the new building would result in it appearing dominant and intrusive in the street scene and the external finishes would be out of character with the existing building. It was considered that satisfactory living conditions would not be created for future occupants due to the failure to meet national standards in regard to minimum ceiling heights and the provision of suitable outdoor spaces. Giving the findings on the other matters, the issue of education contribution was not pursued.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>residents through lack of internal space and room type. The sub-standard layout would be compounded by the lack of suitable outdoor amenity space for all units. As a result, the development represents an overdevelopment of the site contrary to Policies DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD, the Technical Housing Standards and the Housing Standards Minor Alterations to the London Plan. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.</p>	
<p>P0721.16 19 Squirrels Heath Avenue Romford <i>Single and two storey rear extensions, porch, external alterations, replacement windows and re-roofing.</i></p>	<p>Written Repls</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its roof form, excessive width and depth, scale and mass, lack subservience to the existing dwelling, appear incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene and in the rear garden environment and neither preserve or enhance the existing dwelling, or the character and appearance of the Gidea Park Conservation Area contrary to Policies DC61 and DC68 of the LDF and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD. The proposed development would, by reason of its excessive depth, scale,</p>	<p>Part Allowed/Part refused The appeal was dismissed insofar as it relates to the single and two storey rear extensions due to the significant adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring property in regard to outlook. The appeal was allowed insofar as it relates to the porch, external alterations, replacement windows and re-roofing.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>siting and position close to the boundaries of the site, be unneighbourly and provide a "wall of development" which would give rise to an uncomfortable overbearing effect and sense of enclosure and be harmful to the amenity of No. 17 Squirrels Heath Avenue contrary to Policies DC61 and DC68 of the LDF and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.</p>	
<p>P0863.16 356 Wingletye Lane HORNCHURCH <i>Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 2no. four-bedroom houses to the front and 1no. three-bedroom bungalow to the rear.</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed detached bungalow element of the development would, by reason of its prominent rear garden location, height, bulk and mass, appear as an incongruous and unacceptably dominant, overbearing and visually intrusive feature in the rear garden setting which would be harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposal would form a cramped over-development of the site introducing excessive amounts of hardstanding and development into the rear garden environment. The scheme would also severely hinder the rear amenity space for the front pair of dwellings.</p> <p>Consequently the proposed rear bungalow would result in an awkward and jarring visual relationship to the neighbouring properties and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the rear garden environment contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The proposed bungalow to the rear would introduce a building of significant mass and bulk in the rear garden setting of Wingletye Lane. From adjacent properties, the proposal would appear as an isolated and uncharacteristic intrusion in this open area. Furthermore the proposal would introduce a significant amount of hard standing and built development within the existing spacious and verdant rear garden comprising the spacious feel of the area.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				Control Policies DPD. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.	
<p>P0340.16 15 Parkway Romford <i>Application for temporary permission for two years to retain the existing fence.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The boundary fence, by reason of its height and position, has resulted in unsympathetic, visually intrusive development which fails to preserve or enhance the special character of this part of the Gidea Park Conservation Area contrary to Policies DC61 and DC68 of the LDF.	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The fence because of its height has a stark and domineering appearance when viewed from the park's path. A proposal to stain the fence a dark green colour would do little to soften its appearance. The proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the CA's appearance.</p>
<p>P1682.15 13 Hall Terrace Romford <i>Proposed crossover</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed crossover would adversely impact on the safety and efficiency of Colchester Road and bus infrastructure and operations in the locality, contrary to the principles of policy DC32 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. Insufficient information has been supplied with this application to demonstrate that the proposed crossover would not adversely impact on the existing highway tree. This tree is considered of importance in the streetscene and establishing the green infrastructure network along Colchester Road. In the absence of information to demonstrate that the development could	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>It was noted that a comparable proposal had been granted permission in 2016 at a neighbouring property. It was concluded that the formation of the access would not adversely affect the operation of the highway or the bus stop.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				occur without due impact it is considered that the development is contrary to policies DC60 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.	
<p>P1840.15 137 Wennington Road Rainham <i>Change of use of former workshop/studio to a one bed C3 self-contained residential accommodation dwelling.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would have a poor quality amenity area, that is not private and would be unreasonably overlooked by adjacent property, giving rise to a poor quality living environment for future occupiers of the proposed development, contrary to Policies DC4 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The proposal by reason of its unsecure access arrangements would lead to a poor quality residential environment, contrary to the aims of Policy DC4 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure contributions towards the demand for school places arising from the development, the proposal fails to satisfactorily mitigate the infrastructure impact of the development, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC29 and DC72 of the Development Control Policies DPD and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector agreed with the Council in that the proposal would not provide adequate living conditions for future occupants. However the Inspector did not agree that a contribution towards education provision was justified as it did not meet all of the relevant tests, notably being necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.</p>
<p>P0333.16 127 Albany Road Hornchurch <i>Change of use of ground floor unit from A1 shop to</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed change of use, by reason of the increased level of activity within the premises and outdoor areas together with parents and children entering and leaving the premises, would result in	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector found that the proposal would give rise to significant potential for increased congestion in the area closest to the parade and the living conditions of nearby residents</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<i>D1 day nursery.</i>				unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to the detriment of residential amenity, contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The proposal has an absence of drop off points for parents or dedicated parking areas for staff, which would result in an unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity, contrary to Policies DC26 & DC33 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.	would be unacceptably harmed by the increase in noise and disturbance generated by the proposal.
P1888.15 23 Squirrels Heath Avenue Gidea Park Romford <i>Erection of side extension to provide a garage and utility room</i>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed development would, by reason of its design and appearance, result in unsympathetic, visually intrusive development which would not preserve or enhance the special character of this part of the Conservation Area contrary to policies DC61 (Urban Design) and DC68 (Conservation Areas).	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed with Conditions</p> The Inspector concluded that the appeal scheme would not undermine the design or form of the existing dwelling. The proposal would be a sympathetic addition which would not harm the character or appearance of the host building or the local area. Moreover the character and appearance of the CA would be preserved.

TOTAL PLANNING = 34

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
APPEAL DECISIONS - ENFORCEMENT					
Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Reason for Refusal			Inspector's Decision and Comments
ENF/71/15/ 53 Sheffield Drive Harold Hill Romford	Hearing				<p style="text-align: center;">Quashed</p> <p>Evidence by some residents confirmed that cooking facilities had been provided in rooms but that they had subsequently been removed by the landlord. Some of the units had access to cooking facilities at the time of the Council's visit.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that from the limited evidence presented it was likely that any cooking facilities within individual rooms had been removed prior to the service of the notice. Resultantly at the time the notice was served, it is likely that the property was in use as a HMO within Use Class C4.</p> <p>On the balance of probabilities, the matters stated in the notice had not occurred at the time the notice was issued and the property was not in use as six self-contained flats. Accordingly, Appeal B succeeds on ground (b).</p> <p>The appeal was allowed and the enforcement notice was quashed. An application for an award of costs was refused</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>ENF/72/15/ 79 Sheffield Drive Harold Hill Romford</p>	<p>Hearing</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Quashed</p> <p>The evidence presented to the Inspector by both parties was limited and, to some degree conflicting, however it did not indicate that each of the six rooms was in use as a self-contained flat at the time the notice was served. The Inspector concluded that it was likely that the majority of the units shared cooking facilities within the communal kitchen that had been provided. On the balance of probability, the evidence indicated that the alleged breach of planning control to use as six self-contained flats had not occurred as a matter of fact. Accordingly, Appeal B succeeds on ground (b)</p> <p>The appeal was allowed and the enforcement notice was quashed. An application for an award of costs was refused</p>

TOTAL ENF = **2**

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-16 AND 04-DEC-16

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
Summary Info:					
Total Planning =		34			
Total Enf =		2			
Appeals Decided =		37			
Appeals Withdrawn or Invalid =		1			
Total =		36			
	Dismissed		Allowed		
Hearings	0	0.00%	2	5.56%	
Inquiries	1	2.78%	0	0.00%	
Written Reps	23	63.89%	10	27.78%	