

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

APPEAL DECISIONS - PLANNING					
Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P1565.12 14 Beverley Gardens & rear of 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 Beverley Gardens Hornchurch <i>Demolition of No. 14 Beverley Gardens, the formation of a new access road and footpath and the erection of two dwellings consisting of 2No. x3 bedroom bungalows, one with detached double garage and one with integral double garage- Outline Application</i></p>	Hearing	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would be harmful to the open and spacious character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD, the Residential Design SPD and the Emerson Park Policy Area SPD.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of its height, roof form, siting and proximity to the rear gardens of neighbouring properties in Channing Close and Beverley Gardens appear dominant and be harmful to neighbouring residents living conditions including an undue loss of outlook contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to the provisions of Policy DC72 and the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>.The proposed bungalows would have good-sized front and back gardens, and sufficient space around them, to provide a well planted and spacious landscaped setting. Existing trees would be also be retained, and therefore the open and spacious character of the locality would be maintained.</p> <p>Other development in close proximity to the site has a back land character and the Inspector found that these developments have largely maintained the spaciousness and openness which contribute positively to local distinctiveness, and they are now part of the established pattern of development</p> <p>The proposed dwellings would not be unacceptably close to the site boundaries and their scale and appearance could be controlled at reserved matters stage. The Inspector found no reason to expect that they would be so intrusive or so dominant that they would materially harmful to the outlook of the nearby occupiers in their homes or gardens.</p> <p>A planning obligation for a financial contribution towards infrastructure had not been completed at the time of the appeal hearing. However the Inspector did not consider that the requirement for a Planning Obligations met all of the 3 statutory tests in The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. Because all 3 of tests have to be met, even if the planning obligation had been completed, in the Inspectors view it could not have been taken into account.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>The proposal, if granted planning permission on appeal, would be liable for the Mayor of London Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Based upon the information supplied with the application, the CIL payable would be ££4,640. Further details with regard to CIL are available from the Council's website.</p>	
<p>P1333.12 16 Heather Glen Romford <i>Demolish conservatory, two storey side extension and roof alterations to create a new dwelling</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed dwelling would, by reason of its siting, proportions and proximity to the boundaries of the site combined with the width of the plot; give rise to a cramped appearance and overdevelopment, harmful to the open and spacious character of the streetscene contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.</p> <p>In the absence of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution of £6,000 to be used towards infrastructure costs of new development, the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The footprint of the two-storey extension would abut the rear edge of the adjacent pavement. It would result in the loss of the gap between the existing flank wall of the house and the pavement. Resultantly, the proposal would have a flank wall directly adjacent to the footpath, creating an awkward pinch point with the result being an unacceptable visually cramped form of development.</p> <p>No lawfully executed agreement or unilateral undertaking was provided to offset the demands which would arise from the proposed development on local infrastructure and services. The Inspector found the contribution sought satisfied the tests set out in The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and the proposal conflicted with adopted SPD and policy.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				National Planning Policy Framework 2012.	
<p>E0025.12 4 Writtle Walk Rainham <i>Certificate of lawfulness for existing use as A3 Resturant</i></p>	Written Reps		NON DETERMINATION		<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector found that despite the long period of closure, the use throughout 4 Writtle Walk's period of active use has been as a retail unit within Use Class A1. Planning permission has not been granted for any other use and the Inspector was satisfied that the premises have not been used at any time as a restaurant; Use Class A3. This was consistent with the Council's case that these premises had been used primarily for retail purposes within Class A1. The Council's deemed refusal to grant a lawful development certificate was well-founded and the appeal was dismissed.</p>
<p>P1495.12 11 Parkstone Avenue Emerson Park Hornchurch <i>Demolish existing house and create a new six bedroom house with detached swimming pool complex and boundary walls/ gates</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The height, scale, bulk and mass of the replacement dwelling and its position close to the eastern boundary of the site, would appear incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene harmful to the open and spacious character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to the Emerson Park Policy Area SPD and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The proposed boundary treatment by reason of its length, height and design, including a combination of a brick wall, wrought iron railings and timber gates, would appear incongruous, dominant</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The proposal would be significantly higher than the existing house and it would be higher than the developments on either side. The combined width and height of the proposed house would be considerably larger than the existing dwelling and the dwellings in the immediately adjoining area. Resultantly its size and scale would result in an unduly dominant development in the context of its Emerson Park surroundings.</p> <p>Turning to the other elements of the proposal, the Inspector found the large bulk of the swimming pool building combined with its proximity to the highway would result in a</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>and visually intrusive in the streetscene harmful to the character of the surrounding area and the street scene contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The detached swimming pool building would, by reason of its excessive height, proportions, siting and proximity to the eastern boundary of the site, appear overbearing, dominant and visually intrusive in the streetscene, particularly when viewed from Rockchase Gardens, harmful to the open and spacious character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to the Emerson Park Policy Area SPD and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p>	<p>visually intrusive development. Moreover the 2m high solid front boundary walls would adversely affect the open and spacious character of the road.</p>
<p>P1346.12 Land Adj 109 Saunton Road Hornchurch <i>Construction of new one bedroom bungalow.</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, be reason of its form, height, scale, bulk, siting, proximity to the boundaries of the site and a lack of setting, appear as an incongruous and unacceptably cramped overdevelopment of the site, to the detriment of local character and the</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The proposed bungalow would be much nearer the highway than the building line formed by other development along Hartland Road. This would therefore be visually prominent in the street scene. Furthermore</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>streetscene, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of its height, scale, bulk and proximity to the boundaries of the site, appear overbearing, intrusive and out of character within the rear garden environment, harmful to the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p>	<p>it's siting, on one boundary and close to another would not allow sufficient space around the bungalow giving it a cramped appearance. Finally the close relationship of the appeal proposal with both the donor property and other houses in Saunton Road would be likely to adversely affect the outlook from the rear of those properties.</p>
<p>P1480.12 179 Cross Road Romford <i>Residential development</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Approve</p>	<p>Committee</p>	<p>It is considered that the proposal would, by reason of its excessive bulk and intrusive impact in the rear garden scene, have a significant adverse impact on the outlook and amenity of</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The access to the proposed flats would be via a gated narrow drive situated between two houses. The Inspector found that the</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p><i>to provide 6No. 2 bedroom flats. Demolition of the existing dwelling and garage to the front of the site.</i></p>				<p>neighbouring properties, contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. It is considered that the proposal would result in a harmful degree of noise and vehicular disturbance caused by traffic using the proposed access road. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposal would, by reason of its scale and bulk, result in a significantly harmful impact on the setting of the adjacent Green Belt, contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>proposal would result noise intrusion and disturbance from vehicle movements within the external areas of the site. Because of the entry gate and the width of the access, there would be the potential for vehicles to wait with their engines running along this access, including waiting by the ground floor front window of one of the houses adjacent to the proposed gate. Other noise would be from the starting of engines and manoeuvring of vehicles within the parking area. The vehicle related activities would introduce noise disturbance into a relatively quiet area to the rear of the existing dwellings and their gardens that would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Moreover, no adverse harm would be caused by overlooking, loss of privacy, sunlight or daylight. However these matters are substantially and demonstrably outweighed by the unacceptable harm caused by noise impacts associated with the vehicle movements and manoeuvres generated by six flats.</p>
<p>P1069.12 R/O 27 Princes Road Romford <i>Conversion of garage to one bed bungalow</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed conversion of the garage would result in a substandard unit of residential accommodation with poor outlook, privacy and living conditions for future occupiers. In this respect the proposal would be contrary to Policy 3.5 of the London Plan, Policies DC2 and</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The size of the proposed accommodation would be cramped and would not provide a good standard of amenity for future occupants. The cramped nature of the proposal is accentuated by the limited</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>DC4 of the Local Development Framework and the Residential Quality SPD.</p> <p>The proposed development, by reason of its location in close proximity to the adjoining properties, would result in unacceptable loss of privacy and noise disturbance to existing occupiers as well as future occupiers of the proposed dwelling, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF.</p> <p>The proposal would result in the loss of existing off street parking for no. 27 Princes Road, resulting in overspill parking and increased demand for on-street parking where there is limited capacity, contrary to Policy DC32 of the LDF.</p>	<p>amenity space. Neighbouring properties and their private amenity space would be overlooked causing a loss of privacy to their occupants. Therefore the proposal would provide unsatisfactory living conditions for both the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and the future occupiers of the proposed bungalow.</p>
<p>P1419.12 1 Rothbury Avenue Rainham <i>New two bedroom end of terrace dwelling with off street parking</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed dwelling would, by reason of its gabled roof form, siting, proportions and proximity to the boundaries of the site combined with the width of the plot; give rise to a cramped appearance and overdevelopment harmful to the open and spacious character of the streetscene contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The proposed dwelling would, by reason of its height, gabled roofs, depth, proportions, siting and position close to the boundaries of the site, appear a dominant, overbearing, unneighbourly and visually intrusive in the rear garden environment harmful to the amenity of adjacent occupiers, particularly No. 1 Rothbury Avenue contrary to the</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal site occupies a prominent residential corner plot on the junction of two roads. The proposed dwelling would be located adjacent to the existing dwelling. Its size and prominent siting would reduce the existing spaciousness between the existing dwelling and the highway where spacing between dwelling frontages and the highway is consistent. It would result in an incongruous, unduly dominant form of development. The proposed roof would contrast with the prevailing hipped roofs within the vicinity of the site and unbalance the terrace of which the proposed dwelling would form a part of.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>In the absence of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution of £6,000 to be used towards infrastructure costs of new development, the proposal is contrary to Policy DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p>	
<p>P0273.13 37 Maylands Way Romford <i>Single storey detached garage</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its excessive scale, height, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the rear garden environment which would be out of character and harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The proposed garage would fill almost the full width of the garden and would be 12 metres in length with a height to the ridge of the roof of 4 metres. It is considered that due to its scale, height and massing would be visually dominant in the rear garden environment and that this would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P1163.12 Rear of 107 Dagenham Road Romford <i>1No single storey dwelling</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its form, height, scale, bulk, siting and proximity to the boundaries of the site, appear as an incongruous and unacceptably cramped overdevelopment of the site, to the detriment of local character and the streetscene contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The proposed new dwelling would result in an overbearing, intrusive and out of character feature within the rear garden environment harmful to the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties contrary to policy DC61. In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Havering Draft Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of NPPF</p>	<p>Dismissed The proposed bungalow would be sited closer to the footway than the existing garage and forward of the neighbouring property and the general building line. By reason of its siting and height it would appear as an conspicuous and incongruous form of development that would be a cramped form of development because of the limited amenity space around the proposed bungalow. Finally, the poor levels of daylight reaching the only bedroom would result in unsatisfactory living conditions for the future occupiers.</p>
<p>P1160.12 Site Adj to 151 Avon Road Upminster <i>Proposed ground floor</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its height, bulk and mass, roof form and prominent location, be incongruous with the existing form and rhythm of the terrace and would result in</p>	<p>Dismissed The proposal would be three storeys in height and sited forward of the building line to the</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<i>shop(A1/A2) with 2 bedroom maisonette over.</i>				a cramped appearance of the built forms at this corner of the crossroads, harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.	north of the site. The overall size of the proposal would differ from the other units in the parade and this aspect would appear incongruous given the strong symmetrical aspect of the existing design and the disruption of that symmetry. The combination of these factors would result in a visually intrusive development.
<p>P0213.13 Land r/o of 3 & 5 Parsonage Road Rainham <i>2No. x two bedroom semi-detached bungalows with associated amenity and parking</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed development would, by reason of its layout, size, scale and position of the proposed dwellings within the existing rear garden environment, appear isolated and visually intrusive and result in amenity areas which are uncharacteristically small in comparison to the more spacious gardens in the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered to result in development which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and contrary to the NPPF, Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Design SPD. In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> The proposed building would be the only back land development of its type in the immediate area, appearing incongruous in the open suburban garden environment, isolated from any similar built form and poorly integrated with the surrounding properties. In view of the particularly open and spacious character of the rear garden scene and the bulk of built development, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area.

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>the proposal is contrary to Policy DC72 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of NPPF.</p>	
<p>P1313.12 159 Station Lane Hornchurch <i>Retrospective application for the formation of hardstanding, soft landscaping and associated drainage to the front garden of 159 Station Lane.</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The provision of off-street parking in the manner proposed would, by reason of its close proximity to neighbouring bedroom windows, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development giving rise to an unacceptable level of noise, general disturbance as well as headlight and other pollution, seriously prejudicial to the amenities of adjacent occupiers, contrary to Supplementary Design Guidance and Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Submission Development Plan Document.</p> <p>Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>Council guidance states that the formation of parking spaces for first floor flats is unlikely to be acceptable where located adjacent to neighbours' ground floor living room or bedroom windows. The Inspector found that proposed car parking space would more or less directly face a ground floor living room window at very close range. This relationship would unacceptably harm living conditions at the ground floor flat due to disturbance caused by noise and light.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of NPPF	
<p>P1526.12 Rear of 19-25 Ferndale Road Collier Row Romford <i>Variation of condition 9 for part of turning circle now to be block paved.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The car parking area extends beyond the area hatched black on approved plan No. 02.178.01B of planning application P1734.03. Due to the block paving surface, the revised scheme would invite parking in the two areas marked "turning space." Any parking in these areas would prevent the egress of vehicles parked in Parking Spaces 3 and 4 and negate the function of the turning area to facilitate access to the adjoining garages at the rear of properties in Ferndale Road. The proposal will adversely affect the functioning of the site and the turning facilities for vehicles and is therefore considered to be contrary to the Policies DC32, DC33 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Improvements were required to make the proposal acceptable and suitable amendments were suggested during the course of the application, in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. The applicant declined to make the suggested revisions.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The main issues in respect of the enforcement notice appeal (Appeal A) are the effect on (i) the character and appearance of the area and (ii) highway safety with particular regard to the adequacy of space for turning. The main issue in respect of the planning appeal against the refusal to vary condition 9 (Appeal B) is highway safety with particular regard to the adequacy of space for turning.</p> <p>The appeal site sits at the rear of 19-25 Ferndale Road, a predominantly residential area. Planning permission granted on appeal for the erection of two chalet style bungalows subject to conditions. Condition 4 (the landscaping condition) provides that the site shall be landscaped and planted with trees and shrubs in accordance with a scheme approved by the Council before development is commenced. A scheme was submitted to the Council in 2005 and approved in writing confirming the soft landscaping plans were acceptable and condition 4 was discharged. The soft landscaping as implemented is less than that shown on the approved scheme. The failure to implement the approved landscaping scheme causes harm to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>Condition 9 (the access condition) attached to the permission provides that neither of the dwellings shall be occupied until the access</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>road and the area of land has been constructed and marked out in accordance with details approved by the Council. A scheme was submitted to the Council in 2005 and approved in writing confirming the access condition were acceptable and condition 9 was discharged. A planning application submitted in 2012 sought consent to vary condition 9 of the permission. It sought consent for part of the turning circle to be block paved but it was refused in February 2013.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the use of brick paving instead of tarmac as shown on the approved drawing encourages parking on the paving which reduces the perceived useable size of the turning circle. Harm to highway safety is caused by encouraging reversing onto the public highway and increasing the potential for on street parking. The functioning of the site as a turning facility for vehicles is adversely affected and does not accord with the development plan. Both the planning and enforcement notice appeals did not succeed.</p>
<p>P1086.12 6 The Parade Colchester Road Romford <i>Change of use of existing storage/workshop into pre-school for children aged 2-5 years during term times and staff continuous professional</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposal would not include sufficient staff parking or a drop-off zone and therefore falls short of the parking standards contained in the LDF. It is considered that the proposal would result in overspill parking in the area, potentially resulting in significant adverse impacts on highway safety and a nuisance to local residents. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies</p>	<p>Dismissed .The Inspector found that the access to the pre-school area is narrow and there is little turning space for vehicles and a workable drop-off space could not be provided for parents dropping children off which is a Council requirement. Most people would bring children to the pre-school by car and would need to park or drop-off in the street. Given</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<i>development holiday club.</i>				DC26 and DC32 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Improvements were required to make the proposal acceptable and suitable amendments were suggested during the course of the application, in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. The applicant declined to make the suggested revisions.	the lack of off street parking provided and sufficient on-street space to accommodate an increase in demand, it would be highly likely to lead to increased manoeuvring and danger to road users, including pedestrians. Any back up of vehicles on The Parade could make it difficult to turn into the street from the A12.
<p>P0438.13 Former Petrol Service Station Eastern Avenue West Romford <i>Extension of part-completed 2-/3-storey building in mixed commercial/residential building with A1/A2 Use to the ground floor with 7 flats and 12 ancillary parking spaces, to provide two additional one bedroom flats (amendment to P1707.11); totalling 9 units.</i></p>	Written Repls	Refuse	NON DETERMINATION		<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The two additional flats at second floor level would have a mansard roof; however such a feature on a contemporary building would appear at odds with both the character and appearance of the building and its setting. The proposal would also significantly weaken the characteristic stepped appearance of the existing building. Finally, the bulk, scale and position of the proposal would appear unacceptably visually intrusive to occupiers of the nearest dwelling to the north, particularly when in their rear garden</p>
<p>P0515.13 76 Halesworth Road Romford <i>Two storey side extension</i></p>	Written Repls	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed development would, by reason of its width, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene and will close the characteristic gap which separates the	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The extension would appear subordinate to the appeal property and would blend in with the existing terrace and there would be no detrimental effect on the area's character and appearance. Furthermore it would not result</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>subject dwelling from the adjacent terraced block. The resultant development is therefore considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of its particular position and proximity to the neighbouring property, No.78 Halesworth Road seriously overbear and dominate the outlook and general amenity of this property as well as resulting in loss of light. The proposal is therefore considered to have a serious and adverse effect on the living conditions of this occupier and is contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Improvements were required to make the proposal acceptable and suitable amendments were suggested during the course of the application, in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. The applicant declined to make the suggested revisions.</p>	<p>in appreciable loss of daylight and sunlight to the neighbouring garden or habitable rooms within the dwelling nor would the neighbours' privacy be compromised.</p>
<p>P0485.13 land r/o 19 Mildmay Road Romford <i>Conversion of the</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposal, by reason of the self-contained nature of the accommodation proposed, is considered likely to give rise to the creation of a separate planning unit, which would result in</p>	<p>Dismissed The proposed residential annexe does not include a kitchen. Future occupiers of the proposed accommodation would be entirely</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<i>outbuilding to a residential unit</i>				<p>development which is materially out of character with the open, spacious rear garden environment and would potentially result in material harm to neighbouring residential amenity to the detriment of the character of the locality and contrary to the provisions of Policies DC4 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposal would, by reason of its incidental nature and physical separation from the existing kitchen facilities of the flat no. 19, limited privacy and level of overlooking of the new single-aspect property, result in a substandard standard level of amenity for the proposed occupiers, to the detriment of residential amenity, contrary to Policies DC4 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of inadequate on site car parking provision and likely exiting of the site in a reverse gear, result in unacceptable vehicle manoeuvres and overspill of car parking provision onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity, contrary to Policies DC4 and DC32 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to</p>	<p>reliant upon No. 19 Mildmay Road which is physically separate from the proposed residential annexe. To be entirely reliant upon No. 19 for all cooking facilities would not be a realistic or a workable solution, and would not provide those occupiers with a satisfactory standard of living accommodation. The proposed accommodation would be single-aspect, with all windows facing onto the hard-surfaced parking area the rear elevations of the flats opposite. Consequently, the outlook for future occupiers of would be poor and a number of the flat also directly overlook the proposed residential annexe at a relatively short distance, which would result in further loss of privacy to the future occupiers.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.	
<p>P0554.13 31 Preston Road Romford <i>Hardstanding to front of property</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development, entailing paving over of the majority of the front garden area, would be visually harmful to the character and 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> <p>Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The proposal is retrospective as whole of the property frontage is hard surfaced. It was noted there are generally green, planted front gardens of most properties nearby and the hard surfacing to the front of the site gives it a rather harsh and stark appearance. Part of a grass verge which separates the site from the road would need to be removed. This would exacerbate the visual harm caused by the development.</p>
<p>P1303.12 8 Elm Grove Emerson Park Hornchurch <i>Single/two storey side and rear extensions and single storey front extension.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its design, bulk and mass, 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. The proposed development would, by</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>.In the Inspectors opinion, the bulk and design of the proposed side extension position would appear as a dominant addition to the dwelling, which would be unacceptably visually intrusive within the street scene. Although the proposal would not affect the root structures of trees along the boundary in the neighbouring garden, there could be</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>reason of lack of a minimum separation from the site boundary of 2m, result in a cramped development, contrary to Policy DC69 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The proposed development may result in the loss of valuable landscaping which is a feature of the Emerson Park Policy Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DC69 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p>pressure to remove branches in the future which would be to the detriment of the verdant landscape character</p>
<p>P0572.13 33 McIntosh Road Romford <i>Two storey side extension</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its lack of subservience and unsatisfactory design, fail to relate acceptably and would visually unbalance the appearance of this semi-detached property. Moreover, due to the close proximity of the development to the public highway, the proposals would appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene. The development is therefore harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that due to the width, bulk and position of the proposed extension, it would appear as a dominant and incongruous addition which would project forward of the established building line. It would not be in keeping with the spacious corner location and would unbalance this pair of semi-detached dwellings.</p>
<p>P0351.13 58 Norman Road Hornchurch <i>Rear dormer at 1st floor level</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its height, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature within the roofscape of this dwelling which is widely visible both from the streetscene and the rear garden environment. The development would therefore be harmful to the appearance of the surrounding</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The proposed dormer window would be located in the rear roof slope of the existing bungalow. Although it would be prominent within the rear roof plane it would be well contained within the existing roof plane and would not rise above the ridge. It would appear as a harmonious addition to the building.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>area and is contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p>	
<p>P0801.13 18 Little Aston Road Harold Wood <i>Part single and part two storey rear extension</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed two storey rear extension would, by reason of its excessive depth and position close to the boundary with No.20 Little Aston Road, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development which will overbear and dominate the outlook and amenity of this neighbour. The development is therefore 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. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework</p>	<p>Dismissed .The two storey element of the appeal proposal, due to its height and depth would be seen clearly from the rear of neighbouring dwelling. The first floor bedroom and the dining room of neighbouring dwelling which are closest to the common boundary, would be adversely affected. The combined depth and height of the proposed extension in close proximity to these rooms would create a sense of enclosure and an overbearing effect that would be unacceptable.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				2012.	
<p>P0675.13 34 Lake Rise Romford <i>Proposed raised patio area to rear of property and boundary screening</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed development would, by reason of its height, 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 Development Plan Document.	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that in its present form there is unacceptable harm to the neighbours. However with the imposition of planning conditions including screening along the boundary, this could mitigate the harm caused by overlooking and protect the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling.</p>
<p>P0924.13 149 Lancaster Drive Hornchurch <i>Single storey front extension and first floor rear extension</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed front extension would, by reason of its excessive depth, bulk and mass, 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>The alteration of the main entrance to the property to the flank wall, accessed from the shared drive which gains access to two garages in the rear garden environment, is considered to be detrimental to the safety of pedestrians leaving the property, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The proposed extension would be significantly larger than the majority of porches and front extensions in the road, which would be particularly apparent in relation to the front extensions to other properties in the terrace. It is therefore out of keeping with the typical scale of porches and front extensions in the street, and as such would be visually intrusive in the street scene detracting from the character and appearance of the area.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.	
<p>P0749.13 R/O 9 Hood Road Rainham <i>Proposed two bedroom detached chalet bungalow</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its excessive height, roof form, bulk and mass, combined with the narrow width of the plot give rise to a cramped appearance and appear a dominant, overbearing, unneighbourly and visually intrusive feature in the rear garden environment harmful to the amenity of adjacent occupiers contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers would not be affected by an undue loss of outlook as a result of the proposed development. Council policy DC72 aims to ensure that all development contributes to the provision of the services and infrastructure needed in the Borough. All developments providing a net increase of one or more dwellings are required to pay a standard charge of £6,000 per dwelling. The appellant declined to enter into a legal agreement to secure the payment of the standard charge. The Inspector therefore concluded that the scheme would not make sufficient provision for services and infrastructure in the Borough.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				The proposal, if granted planning permission on appeal, would be liable for the Mayor of London Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Based upon the information supplied with the application, the CIL payable would be £1,314.06. Further details with regard to CIL are available from the Council's website.	
<p>P1063.13 37 Glanville Drive Hornchurch <i>Single Storey Side Extension</i></p>	Written Repts	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed side extension lacks subservience and by reason of its close proximity to the flank boundary of the site would appear as an visually intrusive feature in the streetscene. The proposals is therefore contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> The Inspector concluded that whilst the proposed side extension would be sufficiently set back from the frontage of the existing dwelling. However due to its position so close to the side boundary, it would have an adverse effect on the appearance of the surrounding street-scene creating an adverse sense of enclosure at its corner location.

TOTAL PLANNING = 27

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

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

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>ENF/83/12/PT land rear of 19-25 Ferndale Road Collier Row Romford</p>	<p>Written Reps</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The main issues in respect of the enforcement notice appeal (Appeal A) are the effect on (i) the character and appearance of the area and (ii) highway safety with particular regard to the adequacy of space for turning. The main issue in respect of the appeal against the refusal to vary condition 9 (Appeal B) is highway safety with particular regard to the adequacy of space for turning.</p> <p>The appeal site sits at the rear of 19-25 Ferndale Road, a predominantly residential area. Planning permission granted on appeal for the erection of two chalet style bungalows subject to conditions. Condition 4 (the landscaping condition) provides that the site shall be landscaped and planted with trees and shrubs in accordance with a scheme approved by the Council before development is commenced. A scheme was submitted to the Council in 2005 and approved in writing confirming the soft landscaping plans were acceptable and condition 4 was discharged. The soft landscaping as implemented is less than that shown on the approved scheme. The failure to implement the approved landscaping scheme causes harm to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>Condition 9 (the access condition) attached to the permission provides that neither of the dwellings shall be occupied until the access road and the area of land has been</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>ENF/83/12/PT land rear of 19-25 Ferndale Road Collier Row Romford</p>	<p>Written Reps</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>constructed and marked out in accordance with details approved by the Council. A scheme was submitted to the Council in 2005 and approved in writing confirming the access condition were acceptable and condition 9 was discharged. A planning application submitted in 2012 sought consent to vary condition 9 of the permission. It sought consent for part of the turning circle to be block paved but it was refused in February 2013.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the use of brick paving instead of tarmac as shown on the approved drawing encourages parking on the paving which reduces the perceived useable size of the turning circle. Harm to highway safety is caused by encouraging reversing onto the public highway and increasing the potential for on street parking. The functioning of the site as a turning facility for vehicles is adversely affected and does not accord with the development plan.</p> <p>The appeals against the enforcement notice and refusal to vary condition 9 of the permission did not succeed</p>

TOTAL ENF = 1

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 02-NOV-13 AND 14-FEB-14

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<u>Summary Info:</u>					
Total Planning =			27		
Total Enf =			1		
Appeals Decided =			30		
Appeals Withdrawn or Invalid =			2		
Total =			28		
	Dismissed		Allowed		
Hearings	0	0.00%	1	3.57%	
Inquiries	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Written Reps	24	85.71%	3	10.71%	