

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

APPEAL DECISIONS - PLANNING					
Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P0585.13 St Mary & St Peters Church Wennington Road Rainham <i>Demolition of existing church hall and store. Construction of new hall with alterations to access road and new external landscaping and parking</i></p>	Written Reps	Approve With Conditions	Committee	<p>The proposed development would result in material harm to the amenities of occupiers of nearby residential properties by reason of the noise and general disturbance that would arise from social functions and other activities held at the new, larger church hall. In particular harm would be caused by external activities including the intensification of vehicular use of the site access and car parking areas and the use of the rear terrace area which would materially affect the reasonable use and enjoyment of rear gardens by residents. These impacts would be contrary to Policies DC26 and DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Polices Development Plan Document and the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The proposed development would result in an increase in the capacity of the church hall and notwithstanding the increased car parking capacity there would still be a shortfall in relation to the adopted car parking standards. This shortfall in on-site car parking for the proposed larger building would be likely to cause overspill car parking in Wennington Road to the further detriment of the amenities of local residents contrary to Policies DC33 and DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Polices Development Plan Document and the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The appeal site is located in the Green Belt. The NPPF allows for replacement of a building provided the new building would be in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces. The Inspector did not consider the proposed development to be materially larger than the existing form and concluded that it would not be inappropriate development and that in terms of impact on openness it would have a similar effect to the existing buildings.</p> <p>As a replacement for an existing facility rather than a new community facility, the proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on either the residential character of the area or the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings. On the issue of the protected lime tree, the initial harm resulting from its loss would be outweighed in due course by the presence of its replacement in a more appropriate and sustainable location.</p> <p>Finally, the Inspector considered that the proposal would provide the opportunity for improving the junction between the access driveway and Wennington Road. Subject to the imposition of suitable conditions to achieve improved visibility splays and position of entry gates, the proposed development would not be detrimental to highway safety.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its prominent position, height, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably incongruous and visually intrusive feature harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies DC45 and DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The proposed removal of a preserved tree would have a material impact on public amenity and the character of the area contrary to Policies DC60 and DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposed upgraded access to serve the development would present an increased danger to pedestrians using the footway outside of the site due to the inadequate pedestrian visibility splays that would be provided contrary to Policy DC26 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the guidance in the National planning policy Framework.</p>	
<p>P0291.14 24 Avenue Road Romford <i>Proposed single/two storey front & rear extensions</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed first floor front extension would, by reason of its excessive width, bulk and mass, fail to relate acceptably to the subject dwelling and would appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene, and the appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The main issue concerned the design of the first floor front extension. The Inspector found that it would have a subservient relationship with the host dwelling and would not be overly large, because of its design, height & scale. The overall design and layout of the development would not harm the residential</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.	character of the locality, given the domestic scale and architectural style of the front extension.
<p>P0813.14 Land rear of Tesco Express Romford Oaklands Avenue Romford <i>Erection of 9 no. 2 bedroom flats with associated amenity space, car park, landscaping, cycle parking and refuse storage</i></p>	Written Repls	Approve With Conditions	Committee	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its height, 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 and the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The proposed development, in particular the flatted section closest to 1 Oaklands Avenue, would be out of keeping with and harmful to the predominant single residential dwelling character of this part of Oaklands Avenue, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Design Supplementary Planning 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 and Policy DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the site lies at a transition point between Oakland Avenue and Main Road, where a building of larger bulk and mass might be acceptable. The proposal included a building of traditional design, where the bulk is reduced by the frontage being divided into two distinct elements linked by a glazed staircase. The maximum height of the building would be only slightly higher than the adjacent dwelling. Resultantly the proposal would not appear as dominant and visually intrusive and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of this section of Oaklands Avenue.</p>
<p>P0072.14 Land Adj 1 Tempest Way Rainham <i>Demolition of existing</i></p>	Written Repls	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed development would, by reason of its projection beyond the building line of the properties in Mungo Park Road, appear as an unacceptably	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector found that there was no clearly defined prevailing pattern of development in</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<i>garage and construction of a 2 bedroom end of terrace dwelling with private amenity and off street car parking</i>				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. 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.	the locality. Furthermore the proposed development would not appear as unacceptably dominant or visually intrusive within the street scene. On the issue of the financial contribution sought to address the impact of the development on local services and infrastructure; the Inspector considered that it was directly, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed, satisfies the tests set out within the legislation, and is therefore, necessary. The absence of a unilateral undertaking meant that the proposal is contrary to policy and this outweighed the findings on the first issue
P0592.14 80 Lake Avenue Rainham <i>Change of use. Conversion of existing outbuilding to a Granny Annex.</i>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The development would, by reason of its ability to be privately and independently occupied, have to potential to be in constant use with no dependency upon the main dwelling, giving rise to increased levels of noise and disturbance, uncharacteristic of this part of the rear garden environment and harmful to neighbouring amenity, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies DPD.	Allowed with Conditions The annexe would be physically independent of the main house with its own sleeping, living, cooking and bathroom areas. Future occupiers could live in it without the need to enter the main house. It would however be dependent on the main house for power and other utilities, for amenity space and for parking and access. The only access to the annexe other than through the main house would be via a narrow path on the south side of the house. The Inspector considered that the appeal proposal would be unlikely to be occupied by anyone other than people closely associated with the occupants of the main house. The issue of occupancy could be satisfactorily controlled by condition as with any ancillary annexe. Finally the use of the outbuilding as a residential annexe would not give rise to

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life or unreasonable adverse effects on the environment by reason of noise.
<p>P0855.14 Libertie Cottage 12 Orange Tree Hill Havering-Atte-Bower <i>First floor rear extension and part side first floor rear extension to form habitable accommodation</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The site is within the area identified in the Core Strategy and Development Control Submission Development Plan Document Policy Plan as Metropolitan Green Belt. The Core Strategy and Development Control Submission Development Plan Document Policy and Government Guidance as set out in NPPF 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 that new building will only be permitted outside the existing built up areas in the most exceptional circumstances. Insufficient very special circumstances to warrant a departure from this policy have been submitted in this case and the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DC45 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy. The proposal, by reason of the disproportionate additions to the property and their bulk, design and visual impact, would relate poorly to the design of the original property and unacceptably detract from the appearance of the Havering Ridge Area of Special Character, contrary to Policy DC61 and DC69 of the Development Control Policies Development Plan	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> The appeal property is in the Green Belt (GB) and has been extended at the rear and side and also has a large dormer addition. The proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the GB because it would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. It would be an incongruous addition to the dwelling and the increase in the volume, bulk and amount of development would reduce and cause harm to, the openness of the GB.

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				Document Policy and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.	
<p>A0029.14 129-133 Abbs Cross Lane Hornchurch <i>Retention of illuminated signage on shop frontage</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The 2 no box signs, by reason of their height, design, appearance, colour scheme and size give rise to a cluttered and excessively strident appearance, which is visually intrusive and out of character with the existng building, harmful to the streetscene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal will therefore detract from visual amenity and is contrary to Policies DC61, and DC65 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Shopfront Design SPD.	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector found that the signage would appear overly large and bulky for the size of the shop, appearing box-like and projecting outwards from the building. Due to the size and strident colours, the signage appears dominating, overly cluttered and fussy, detracting from the building's appearance, and thereby harming the character and appearance of the area.</p>
<p>P0660.14 112 Squirrels Heath Road Harold Wood <i>Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed development would, by reason of its design which relates poorly to the original house, appear as an unacceptably dominant, discordant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene, 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 and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The Inspector found that the proposal would be subordinate to the host dwelling and of a sufficiently high standard of design so as not to appear as unduly bulky or overbearing to cause a detrimental effect to its character and appearance.</p>
<p>P0744.13 58-60 Station Road Upminster <i>The demolition of existing building and</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Committee	The proposed development would, by reason of its height and scale would appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The proposal is to replace the existing building with a new one comprising two elements, a main building and a rear wing.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p><i>construction of new mixed use building with retail use on the ground floor with a cycle store and two bin stores and 7 residential flats on the upper floors.</i></p>				<p>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.</p>	<p>The proposed main building to Station Road would have a scale, appearance, and presence within the street scene appropriate for its location.</p> <p>The rear wing element in Howard Road would however appear as an unconnected substantial intrusion between the proposed main building and the adjacent dwellings in Howard Road. A four-storey element of the rear wing would appear as an incongruous and ungainly projection above the roofline that would be harmful to the coherence and appearance of the streetscape along Howard Road. Furthermore, the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of occupants of a building to the north of the site in terms of daylight and sunlight</p> <p>Recently introduced guidance in the Governments Planning Practice Guidance identified circumstances where infrastructure contributions through planning contributions should not be sought. The Inspector concluded that the appellants' not having submitted a planning obligation was not a reason for dismissing the appeal</p>
<p>P0708.14 17 Tudor Avenue Romford <i>Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of new ground and first floor rear</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed first floor rear extension would, by reason of its excessive depth, scale, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the rear garden scene. The development is therefore harmful to the character and</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the scale and design of the proposed extension would be sympathetic to and not cause material harm to the character and appearance to the surrounding area. The proposal would not create an unacceptable loss of outlook for</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<i>extensions.</i>				appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policies DC61 and DC69 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document The first floor rear extension would, by reason of its excessive depth would have an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers at No.19 Tudor Avenue, contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Document and Policies DC61 and DC69 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.	occupiers the neighbouring dwelling in their rear rooms or their rear garden nor, would there be a material loss of either sunlight or daylight to these rooms
P0741.14 54 Marlborough Gardens Upminster <i>Roof alterations and addition of flat roof dormer to courtyard area</i>	Written Repts	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed roof alteration/extension would, by reason of its excessive scale, bulk, mass and design, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature to the property, harmful to the character and appearance of the rear garden scene and a detriment to 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 style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> The proposal was to raise the height of the roof of a single storey link that connects the two one-and-a-half storey elements of the dwelling. The increase in scale, bulk and mass would result in it being less subservient. It would appear as a dominant and visually intrusive feature, harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Moreover the dormer would not relate well to the windows of the original dwelling in terms of proportion, design and position.
P0259.14 119 Marlborough Road Romford <i>Change of Use from A2 to residential, demolition of disused commercial</i>	Written Repts	Refuse	Delegated	The proposal, by reason of its bulk, mass, depth and prominent side gabled feature, appear as a visually intrusive and overbearing form of development within the streetscene and the neighbouring rear garden environment,	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed with Conditions</p> The proposed elevation to Marlborough Road would be simple in design and form and of similar height to other buildings nearby. Although wider at the front than the existing building, the proposal would not appear

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p><i>premises and erection of 2 No 1 bedroom flats and 2 No 2 bedroom flats with associated amenity space, car parking, access, landscaping and refuse storage</i></p>				<p>resulting in material harm to local character and amenity, contrary to Policies DC3 and DC61 of the Local Development Framework and Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Design.</p> <p>The proposal would, by reason of its height, bulk, mass and design, particularly the location of balconies to the site frontage and the main entrance to the flank of the building, appear out of scale and character with neighbouring development and out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development in the streetscene, thereby adversely impacting on the character of the locality contrary to Policy DC61 of the Local Development Framework and</p>	<p>excessively wide or out of keeping in the street scene. It would maintain the prevailing pattern and rhythm of the street, creating a corner building with 2 public elevations of design interest, reflecting local design characteristics. The signed and dated unilateral undertaking submitted by the appellant passed the relevant statutory tests.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Design.</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 Policy DC72 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	
<p>P0628.14 Emerson Park Court Billet Lane Hornchurch <i>Outline permission for the construction of a crown roof to accommodate three additional flats and associated parking.</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 in the streetscene 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>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.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal related to an outline application with all matters reserved however the Inspector found the submitted plans provided a useful indication of the most likely way in which the site might be developed. The additional storey would result in a further storey to what is already a tall building when viewed in the context of the wider street scene that typically comprises two storey buildings. The visual prominence of a further storey would be an incongruous and unacceptable addition to the host building when viewed in the context of the wider street scene in terms of its height, bulk and mass.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the absence of a planning obligation meant that the proposal would fail to make provision for local infrastructure necessary to allow the development to proceed in conflict with Policy DC72 was an additional reason to dismiss the appeal.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P0823.14 28 Tudor Gardens Romford <i>Erect two storey side and rear extension and alter elevations.</i></p>	<p>Written Repls</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed roof and depth of the first floor rear extension would relate unacceptably to the existing dwelling and appear as a dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene and rear garden environment. The development is therefore harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area and contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposed first floor rear extension would, by reason of its excessive depth and extensive roof area, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development, which would be most oppressive and give rise to an undue sense of enclosure in the rear garden environment to the detriment of residential amenity contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposed "juliette" balconies would, by reason of its position and proximity to neighbouring property at No.26 Tudor Gardens, result in a perceived and actual loss of privacy due to overlooking which would have a serious and adverse effect on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, contrary to the London Borough of Havering Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Extensions and Alterations</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The proposed 2-storey extension at the side would result in significant additional massing at the side of the dwelling visible from the street. This side extension would appear as a bulky and awkward addition, significantly altering the symmetry and unbalancing the pair of dwellings materially harming the character and appearance of the street scene. In respect of outlook and privacy, the proposal would not harm to nearby residents' living conditions.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.	
<p>P0765.14 129-133 Abbs Cross Lane Hornchurch <i>Retention of shop front shutters & light boxes</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The retention of the shopfront as proposed of which the roller shutters and roller shutter box forms an integral part; would by reason of their prominence and siting, be harmful to the general appearance of this parade of shops and visually intrusive in the streetscene. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policies DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the provisions of the Shopfront SPD and the NPPF.	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The roller shutter boxes are positioned below the fascia signs, projecting outwards from the face of the shop fronts. They have a bulky appearance appearing disproportionate in scale to the shop front and in combination with the fascia signs, the proposal materially harms the character and appearance of the host building.</p>
<p>P1105.14 150 North Street Romford <i>Demolition of garages and erection of a new build 1 bedroom bungalow.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its bulk and mass, forward of no. 1 The Avenue appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area 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 the restricted plot size and positioning of the building close to the boundaries, as well as the limited provision of amenity space, result in a cramped over-development of the site to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers and the character of the surrounding area contrary to Policy</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The proposed bungalow would sit considerably forward of the front building line of properties in The Avenue and would have a significantly greater mass than the existing garages. In views along The Avenue the dwelling would intrude in the streetscape and appear at odds with the established built form. The density of development on the plot would be high and appear cramped to the detriment of the established character of the area. On the issue of the quality of space and the outlook from the property, the Inspector did not think that this would significantly harm the living conditions of future occupiers of the bungalow.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. 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.	
<p>P1193.14 5 Barleycorn Way Hornchurch <i>Two storey front and side/rear extensions</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed development would, by reason of its proximity to the northern boundary of the site, unacceptably reduce the characteristic gap between the subject dwelling and its neighbouring property, giving rise to a terracing effect, which would be harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policies DC61 and DC69 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The Council's concerns related to the demolition of the garage and the erection in its place of a two-storey side extension which would lead to the possible terracing effect. However, the Inspector considered that a gap and an appropriate level of separation would remain at first floor level if this proposal was implemented. The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would sit acceptably in its visual context without causing harm.</p>
<p>P0620.14 1 Miller Close Collier Row Romford <i>Single storey dwelling with associated works</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed bungalow would, by reason of its height, 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. 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	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The development would be both larger in footprint and in height than the existing garage. However, it would be modestly sized, sit comfortably within its plot and landscaping could effectively screen it.</p> <p>On the issue of infrastructure contributions, the Inspector found that it would be necessary and directly related to the development. However given the recent changes to guidance that states that contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, the request for a developer contribution would not relate</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				and Development Control Policies DPD.	in scale and kind to the development.
<p>P1199.13 45 Lower Mardyke Avenue Rainham <i>Proposed two storey side and rear extension including loft conversion. Proposed alteration and pitched roof to existing rear outbuilding.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed single storey front extension when viewed in conjunction with the existing porch would relate unacceptably to the existing dwelling by reason of its excessive depth, scale, bulk and mass and appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The two storey side extension would, by reason of its design,height, bulk, mass and roof form, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature both in the street scene and rear garden environment. As a result, the development is considered to be harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area and damaging to its character, contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The two storey side and rear extension would, by reason of its scale, bulk and</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The proposed single storey front and two storey side extensions would bring the built form of the host property closer to a neighbouring bungalow. However they would be of an appropriate scale and mass that would provide a degree of subordination to the host property and would not appear unacceptably dominant or visually intrusive within the street scene.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>mass, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development, which would be most oppressive and give rise to an undue sense of enclosure to the detriment of residential amenity contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposed roof of the outbuilding would, by reason of its excessive height and position close to the boundaries of the site, be an unneighbourly development which creates a dominant and visually intrusive feature in the rear garden environment that is harmful to the amenity of adjacent occupiers, contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p>	
<p>P0990.14 2 Maylands Avenue Hornchurch <i>Erection of 2 bedroom dwelling house with associated car parking and private garden space on land adjoining No.2 Maylands Avenue.</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposal by reason of its scale and siting in relation to the building line in South End Road would be a cramped overdevelopment of this site, visually intrusive and out of character in the streetscene 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>In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The relatively close proximity of the proposed dwelling to the highway means that it would intrude upon the street scene. It would be significantly closer to the highway than the houses in Southend Road to the north and south of the junction. It would have an unduly dominating presence that would fail to maintain the rhythm and continuity of the street scene.</p> <p>On the second issue, the failure to provide a completed obligation addressing the</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				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.	infrastructure costs of the proposal reinforced the objection to the scheme.
<p>P0867.14 11 Spinney Close Rainham <i>First floor side extension over existing garage.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed first floor extension located above an existing garage would, by reason of its particular relationship with the adjoining neighbour, No.9 Spinney Close and its bulk, depth, and height dominate and overbear this neighbour and result in general loss of amenity and light. The development is therefore considered to be an intrusive and unneighbourly form of development and is therefore contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The proximity of the proposed extension and its orientation towards the neighbouring property would lead to very close and direct overlooking into their garden and conservatory and would lead to a serious loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupants. Furthermore, given its proximity and its height, it would lead to a likely reduction in levels of daylight and sunlight to the rooms of the neighbour that face to the rear.</p>
<p>P0868.14 1 Gaynes Road Upminster <i>Proposed outbuilding.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposal makes insufficient provision within the site for sight visibility plays. As a consequence the movement of vehicles in and out of the building would create conditions highly detrimental to pedestrian and highway safety, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The proposed garage would be constructed close to the boundaries of the site, and its walls would significantly restrict visibility, with any vehicle needing to emerge onto the footway in advance of clear views of the path. Visibility would be even more restricted if vehicles were to reverse from the garage. The footpath in front of the appeal site was well used and would create unacceptable highway hazards to pedestrians.</p>
<p>P0979.14 27 Burwood Gardens Rainham <i>Erection of 1 no. two-storey detached house</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed development would, by reason of its prominent side garden location, siting, design and position close to the boundaries of the site, form an incongruous and awkward feature within the streetscene, to the detriment	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The proposed house would be located very close to the boundary with the highway at its south western corner. The nearness of a two storey house at this position would be out of character with the pattern of development</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>of the character 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 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.</p>	<p>seen in the locality and appear unduly imposing and obtrusive in views along the street.</p> <p>The Council's request for a planning obligation was considered necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. However, no completed obligation was submitted and this was contrary to Policy DC72 and the SPD</p>
<p>P1315.14 30 Hood Road Rainham <i>New front wall and railings</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed boundary treatment would, by reason of its height, 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 style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the proposed front and right wall and railings, would be prominent when approaching along Hood Road from the north-east, where they would significantly diminish the open and spacious character in this part of the street scene. Whilst fear of crime was a material consideration, it did not outweigh the significant harm that the scheme would cause to the character and appearance of the area.</p>

TOTAL PLANNING = **24**

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

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/419/14/ Watermans 53/57 Junction Road Romford	Written Reps				Dismissed Both trees have been pruned , but this does not distract from their appearance and they make a significant , positive contribution to the local amenity.

TOTAL ENF = 1

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 08-NOV-14 AND 13-FEB-15

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
Summary Info:					
Total Planning =		24			
Total Enf =		1			
Appeals Decided =		25			
Appeals Withdrawn or Invalid =		0			
Total =		25			
	Dismissed		Allowed		
Hearings	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Inquiries	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Written Reps	15	60.00%	10	40.00%	