

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

APPEAL DECISIONS - PLANNING					
Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P0338.11 119 Rainham Road (Former Cherry Tree P.H.) Rainham <i>Erection of restaurant with drive thru facility (Class A3/A5), parking and associated works.</i></p>	Hearing	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its height, bulk, mass and projection into the rear of the site, appear as an unacceptably intrusive and visually overbearing feature in the rear garden environment of no. 268 Cherry Tree Lane harmful to visual amenity contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposal would, by reason of the likely noise and general disturbance caused by vehicles manoeuvring through the drive thru lane, particularly during the evening hours of operation, be unacceptably detrimental to the amenities of occupiers of no. 268 Cherry Tree Lane contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The applicant is advised that in the event of a resubmission the Council would look to secure a financial contribution by way of a legal agreement towards accessibility improvements to bus stops within the vicinity of the application site in accordance with Policies DC32 and DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions This appeal was considered concurrently with a later [modified] proposal for similar development of the same site. Both appeals were allowed. The decisions in both appeals are summarised below</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P0746.11 119 Rainham Road Rainham <i>Erection of restaurant with drive thru facility (Class A3/A5), parking and associated works</i></p>	<p>Hearing</p>	<p>Approve With Conditions</p>	<p>Committee</p>	<p>The proposal would, by reason of the likely noise and general disturbance caused by vehicles using the premises, particularly during the evening hours of operation, be unacceptably detrimental to the amenities of adjoining occupiers in Cherry Tree Lane and Cherry Walk 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 nature, form and location within an area which has historically suffered from disorder, be likely to give rise to youth congregation and incidences of anti-social behaviour which would be materially harmful to amenity and sense of safety of the area, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC61 and DC63 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The applicant is advised that in the event of a resubmission the Council would look to secure a financial contribution by way of a legal agreement towards accessibility improvements to bus stops within the vicinity of the application site in accordance with Policies DC32 and DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>This summary relates to two separate decisions [P0338.11 and P0746.11] to 2 appeals relating to development of the site. The Inspector identified the following main issues in both Appeals [a] visual impact of the building and impact of noise and disturbance on living conditions of neighbours. [b] impact on crime and anti-social behaviour [c] adequacy of and impact on public transport [with regard to need for financial contribution]</p> <p>On issue [a] he noted the building would be free-standing and rectangular in shape and of contemporary design. In the later appeal the building was slightly smaller, and set down slightly into the ground, so that overall height was reduced. Either building would be readily seen but each was set well away from the boundary. In time views would be filtered by the proposed landscaping. Because of orientation there would be no material loss of sunlight or daylight. Neither building would dominate outlook from the nearest dwelling</p> <p>The Inspector noted that noise levels would be below WHO Guidelines and within existing background levels at the site. There had been no challenge to the Assessment. He reasoned that noise would occasionally be audible from nearby dwellings but external noise from the local centre must already be an issue. He concluded both visual and audible impacts of the development were acceptable in accordance with policy DC61</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>On issue [b] the Inspector noted police concerns that the new premises might re-ignite anti-social behaviour that had affected the area. He was not persuaded. There were several existing takeaways in the vicinity. However, it was appropriate that operation of the development should minimise opportunity for crime and disorder. Suitable conditions could be imposed.</p> <p>On issue [c] the Inspector found that only a small proportion of users would travel by bus. The Council had not properly justified its request for a financial contribution for upgrading the Bus Stop opposite the site with regard to CIL Regulations.</p>
<p>P1488.09 Sandy Lane Farm Sandy Lane, Aveley <i>Outline application for the redevelopment of the site for up to 86,112.7sqm of employment development comprising approximately:30,877.99 sqm B1, 10,164sqm B2, 42,755sqm B8 & 2,315sqm of other uses, which will include space for a porter, a hotel/cafe and a creche. Means of access to be approved, with all other matters reserved</i></p>	<p>Local Inquiry</p>		<p>Committee</p>		<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The application was called in by the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State agreed with the Inspectors conclusions on the main issues in the appeal and the recommendation that planning permission should be refused.</p> <p>Employment Need and Land Supply the provision of a further employment site would be of limited benefit unless it was also able to satisfy a demand that other sites could not. Diversification of the employment offer would be a benefit of the proposal but accepts the view forwarded by Havering that securing office development has not been shown to be critical to the diversification of Thurrock s economy nor does the policy framework see diversification as critical to delivery of Thurrock s employment targets. The available evidence demonstrates that</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>sufficient employment land is available to meet the growth targets. The qualitative benefits offered by the application site are likely to be applicable to any Greenfield site. The site is clearly not the only option to developing high end office development. The high proportion of B2/B8 development compromises the rationale for choosing Sandy Lane and this is an important shortcoming.</p> <p>Impact on Green Belt The proposal would significantly reduce the openness of the Green Belt, consolidate the developed area between Purfleet and Aveley and be a significant encroachment into the countryside.</p> <p>Sustainability The site is poorly served by public transport and cannot be regarded as sustainable for B1 development, contrary to national planning policy.</p> <p>Highway Safety There would be a net improvement to highway safety, particularly the Sandy Lane junction and this carries some limited weight in favour of the development.</p> <p>Very Special Circumstances Whilst the proposal would facilitate the provision of some 2400 jobs, diversify the employment offer, bring forward jobs earlier than developing on existing brownfield land and is of a high quality design, this has to be balanced against the harm identified above.</p> <p>Conclusion The proposal is in conflict with</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>the development plan. The harm to the Green Belt, to the regeneration of the urban area of Thurrock and to sustainability are substantial and that to these is added the harm to the character and appearance of the area. The benefits of the proposal are generally moderate or limited and to some extent speculative and they clearly do not outweigh the totality of the harm. The very special circumstances necessary to justify this development in the Green Belt do not exist.</p>
<p>P1199.10 44 Farnes Drive Gidea Park Romford <i>Two storey side extension</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed two storey side extension would, by reason of its flat roof design prominent location represents a unsatisfactory design solution which would unbalance this pair of semi-detached properties and appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area contrary to the Supplementary Design Guidance (Residential Extensions and Alterations) of the Havering Unitary Development Plan and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposed first floor flank windows would by reason of their position and proximity to neighbouring property (No.46 Farnes Drive, Romford) cause overlooking and loss of privacy which would have a serious and adverse effect on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, contrary to the</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal raised 3 main issues [a] impact on local character and amenity [b] impact on living conditions of neighbours [c] impact on highway safety</p> <p>On issue [a] the Inspector noted the extension design was broadly in keeping with one nearby. He observed that design was important and he concluded that the 2-storey flat roofed structure was rudimentary and wholly incompatible with the design of the host dwelling. It would be harmful to local character and amenity</p> <p>On issue [b] he observed that two bedroom windows were proposed in the side elevation and would directly overlook a neighbouring garden, at close quarters. That would result in unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy.</p> <p>On issue [c] the Inspector commented on lack of clarity in the plans and concluded [as it had not been shown whether and how on-site parking would be provided], the proposal</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Supplementary Design Guidance (Residential Extensions and Alterations) and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate on site car parking provision, result in unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity and contrary to the Supplementary Design Guidance (Residential Extensions and Alterations) and Policy DC2 and DC33 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Plan Document.</p> <p>1. The applicant is advised that in preparing any resubmission the following amendments would need to be considered:</p> <p>* A hipped roof would need to be incorporated into the design of the two storey side extension.</p> <p>* The removal of the first floor flank windows and the provision of a screen fencing on the boundary at ground floor level to protect the privacy of the unattached neighbour at No.46 Farnes</p>	<p>would generate on- street parking and lead to local congestion to the detriment of highway safety</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Drive, Romford.</p> <p>* A plan should be submitted with the re-submission showing that two car parking spaces of 4.8m by 2.4m can fit on the front and side forecourt after allowing for the two storey side extension without encroaching onto the neighbouring property.</p> <p>2. The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not grant permission for any part of the development (guttering) to encroach onto any property not within the applicant's ownership.</p>	
<p>P1300.10 18 Como Street Romford</p> <p><i>Retrospective permission to retain conversion of semi-detached dwelling into 2 no. self contained flats</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development, by reason of its provision of a communal garden area towards the rear of both flats and the positioning of a lounge area to the rear of the ground floor flat, results in overlooking and loss of privacy to occupiers of the ground floor flat, having a serious and adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the ground floor flat, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposal by reason of its sub-standard layout does not provide convenient and direct access to the</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The Inspector identified four main issues [a] impact on living conditions for occupiers of the ground floor flat [b] adequacy of outdoor amenity space [c] impact on living conditions of neighbours [d] impact on on-street parking arrangements</p> <p>On [a], The Inspector observed that windows of the ground floor flat looked directly out onto a narrow side garden shared with the upstairs property. That would result in unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy that could be overcome by sub-dividing the outside space to provide separate self contained spaces for each flat - he could impose a condition to that</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>amenity space for the occupants of first floor flat, with the only convenient and direct access being afforded to the occupants of the ground floor flat, contrary to the requirements of the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document and Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposed conversion of the existing dwelling into self contained flats is of an unacceptable internal layout that leads to additional noise and general disturbance to the adjoining neighbouring property through noise transmission contrary to Policies DC4 and DC61 of the LDF Development Plan Document.</p>	<p>effect.</p> <p>On [b] he observed that the development was within reasonable walking distance of Cottons Park. He also noted that the Residential Design SPD stresses the need for every home to have access to private and/or communal space. He concluded that as proposed, arrangements for amenity space was unsatisfactory. He identified that the condition he had identified to resolve issue [a] would also remedy this issue.</p> <p>On [c] he observed the juxtaposition of a "new" living room with the bedroom of an adjoining property that could cause unacceptable noise and disturbance to the neighbour. A condition requiring additional soundproofing would overcome his concern.</p> <p>On [d] he observed that 3 vehicles could be parked within the site frontage and would satisfy DC33. He noted the Council sought a S106 Agreement to prevent occupiers from applying for Parking Permits for additional vehicles. Absence of an Agreement did not conflict with policy DC2 or justify dismissal of the appeal</p>
<p>P0996.10 2A Woburn Avenue Elm Park, Hornchurch <i>Retrospective permission for 4 no. flats following changes to P1105.01 and P1189.03</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The development, by reason of the internal and external layout, particularly the cramped studio flat arrangement, the location of parking in relation to habitable rooms, lack of private, useable amenity space and the lack of privacy for occupiers of the ground floor flat B, is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site, resulting in poor quality living</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>It was noted that planning permission had previously been obtained to convert the building to 2 flats. The appeal was against retrospective refusal of permission to create 4 flats within the same space.</p> <p>The Inspector identified 3 main issues</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>conditions, contrary to the aims of good design and detrimental to the amenities of occupiers of the development, contrary to the Residential Design SPD, PPS1 and Policies DC4 and DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The development, for the reasons set out above, is considered to be of insufficient high quality to justify the resultant density of development and is contrary to the provisions of PPS1 and PPS3.</p> <p>The development, by reason of its internal layout results in habitable rooms adjoining the bedrooms of the neighbouring dwelling which is detrimental to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, materially harmful to residential amenity and contrary to Policy DC4 of the LDF Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The development is unable to provide an acceptable level of off-street parking without resulting in deficient amenity space provision and resultant harm to residential amenity through vehicle noise, movement and light pollution. To provide adequate amenity space the resultant shortfall in parking would give rise to unacceptable overspill onto the public highway to the detriment of</p>	<p>[a] impact on living conditions of occupiers [b] impact on highway safety [c] impact on living conditions at the neighbouring property</p> <p>On issue [a] he observed that the individual units were small. Although the tyerm is not defined,the smallest one must be a "studio flat" although the term is not defined. Policy DC4 does not support provision of such accommodation. Parking would take up most of the available external space and intensive use of the yard would impact on the occupiers of the nearest flat that had a single aspect over the yard. Occupiers of that unit would get no relief from disturbances and lack of privacy arising from yard activities. Living conditions would be unacceptably poor and the proposal conflicted with policy DC4 and the Residential Design SPD</p> <p>On [b] he observed a shortage of on-street parking in adjoining streets. He deduced that, if all available space was used, 3 off-street spaces might be provided. He concluded there was inadequate on-site parking provision and the development would prejudice other highway safety interests contrary to policy DC4.</p> <p>On issue [c] the Inspector concluded there was no evidence before him that the new living accommodation would adjoin existing bedrooms next door. In that event a planning condition requiring sound insulation would be appropriate. There wa no conflict with policies DC4 and DC61</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				highway safety. The development is therefore contrary to Policies DC33 and DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies DPD.	
<p>P1742.10 Unit r/o 207 Ardleigh Green Road Hornchurch <i>Change of use from B1 to form 2 retail units (A1)and shopfronts</i></p>	Written Reqs	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposal would result in a material intensification of the use of the site. This would be likely to give rise to a material increase in pedestrian activity in Helen Road and, by reason of the absence of off street car parking, would also be likely to give rise to a material increase in vehicular activity and requirement for deliveries and servicing to take place on street in Helen Road. This is considered likely to be materially harmful to the residential character of Helen Road, and would result in material harm to the amenity of occupiers of nearby residential property, particularly No. 1 Helen Road, through an increase in noise and disturbance and would be 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 identified the main issue as [a] whether lack of off-street parking would harm residential amenity or highway safety</p> <p>He noted that the area was primarily residential and there was considerable pressure on on-street parking locally that was likely to increase during school term-time. The location was sustainable so that employees at the B1 Unit could park elsewhere and/or use public transport to get to work. Retail use would create a wholly different pattern of parking and servicing. While the premises had a rear yard filled with vehicles it had no convenient access to the proposed shops.</p> <p>He concluded that when the 2 parking spaces outside the premises were occupied, vehicles were likely to park on yellow lines or outside dwellings. Taking account of the school opposite, and likely volume of young pedestrians, any increase in parking and service vehicles would adversely impact upon pedestrians and other highway users. He further concluded that residents, already inconvenienced by school traffic movements may be subjected to additional disturbance or nuisance from banging of car doors.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P1328.10 11 Ryder Gardens Rainham <i>Change of use of first floor from residential to nursery and increase of number of children on site from 12 to 36 and number of children outside from 6 to 12 and 1m boundary fence</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The development would, by reason of the inadequate on site car parking provision, result in unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity and contrary to Policies DC33 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies. The development would, by reason of the increase in the number of children allowed on site and number of children allowed outside, result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to the detriment of residential amenity and contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The development would result in the loss of a residential unit and turn a property into a fully commercial use in a residential area, where there has been no justification provided, the proposals are therefore contrary to Policy DC1 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector identified 2 main issues [a] impact of any noise and disturbance on living conditions of neighbours [b] impact on pedestrian and highway safety</p> <p>On [a], the Inspector noted the close juxtaposition of the use to houses in a generally quiet residential area. The main sources of noise and disturbance would come from a significant number of congregating children, the comings and goings by car and on foot of numerous parents and carers fairly early in the morning and in the evening. He said that sound of children playing would be constant throughout the day especially during the summer and would be trying. He disagreed with the appellant, that enclosure fencing would satisfactorily attenuate noise and concluded that the proposal would harm residential amenity, particularly of those living closest to the premises, contrary to policies DC26 and DC61.</p> <p>On issue [b] he observed that the adjacent roads are not wide and the number of vehicle cross-overs limited on-street parking. Additional vehicle movements and indiscriminate parking would increase risk to safety of pedestrians and other drivers to an unacceptable level, contrary to policy DC26</p>
<p>P1898.10 51 Upminster Road South Rainham <i>Change of use of existing basement into a one bed</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The size, position and orientation of the windows would provide limited light and outlook to the flat which would be harmful to the residential amenity of future occupiers contrary to Policies</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector considered 3 main issues [a] whether satisfactory living conditions would be created for future occupiers of the flat</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<i>flat.</i>				<p>DC4 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The layout, siting and width of the amenity space for the new dwelling would result in an unacceptably cramped layout and poor quality of amenity space provision which is materially harmful to the amenity of future occupiers contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies DPD and the Design for Living SPD.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate on site car parking provision, result in unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity contrary to Policies DC2 and DC33 of the LDF Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>No flood risk assessment has been submitted as part of the planning application as required by PPS25. The application site lies within Flood Zone 3a as defined by Planning Policy Statement 25 as having a high probability of flooding. The proposed development falls into a flood risk vulnerability category that is inappropriate to the Flood Zone in which the application site is located, which is contrary to Policy DC48 of the Local Development Framework Development Plan</p>	<p>[b] impact on highway safety [c] whether the development would unacceptably add to the number of people at risk from flooding</p> <p>On [a] he observed that the basement was enclosed on 3 sides with a single external wall facing an enclosed courtyard. Natural daylight would be severely restricted and the layout would create a cramped, enclosed and oppressive outlook for the internal living spaces. Artificial lighting was not an acceptable alternative to natural daylight. 2 parking spaces in the courtyard exacerbated the cramped and oppressive outlook. Living conditions would not be acceptable. The proposal was contrary to policies DC61 and DC4</p> <p>On [b] the Inspector observed that unrestricted on-street parking was limited. Proximity to good transport links mitigated risk of heavy demand for parking and the proposal showed provision of 2 off-street spaces. The development satisfied policy DC33.</p> <p>On [c] the Inspector noted the development was in an area at high risk of flooding. No flood risk assessment had been undertaken and measures proposed to mitigate flood-risk had been not been shown to be practical and effective. There would be an unacceptable increase in the number of people at risk from flooding, contrary to DC48 and PPS25.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				Document and PPS25.	
<p>A0002.11 40 Station Lane Hornchurch <i>Installation of 1 illuminated fascia sign. 1 pole mounted illuminated sign, 2 illuminated menu signs, 2 side barrier windbreaks and umbrellas with signage</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed pole mounted sign would, by reason of its excessive height and forward location, be an incongruous feature which fails to integrate with the existing building and appear unduly prominent and visually intrusive in the streetscene harmful to the amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Policies DC61 and DC65 of the LDF Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposed high level fascia sign and menu signs would, by reason of their excessive size and forward location, be an incongruous feature which fails to integrate with the existing building and appear unduly prominent and visually intrusive in the streetscene harmful to the amenity of the surrounding area contrary to Policies DC61 and DC65 of the LDF Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The Inspector identified the main planning issue as the ongoing impact of the advertisements on visual amenity</p> <p>The Inspector observed that a diverse range of advertisements were already displayed in association with the terrace of shops. It was agreed that the existing signs were visually acceptable. The additional signage was largely designed to match what existed. He rejected argument that the new signs "cluttered" the local streetscene. Instead he found that the display, as a whole, was a themed and suited entity that was appropriate to the character and appearance of this largely commercial area adjacent to the town centre. None of the signs caused harm to visual amenity</p>
<p>P0137.11 207A Ardleigh Green Road Hornchurch <i>Change of use of first floor office (B1) to self contained flat (C3) at 207 Ardleigh Green Road.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate on site car parking provision, result in unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity and contrary to Policies DC2, DC33 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The Inspector identified 2 main issues [a] impact on highway safety and residential amenity taking account of provision for on-site parking [b] impact on outlook of neighbours and provision of amenity space</p> <p>On [a] he observed that most of the nearby</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

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 the inadequate provision of amenity space, combined with poor outlook, result in a cramped over-development of the site and poor standard of living accommodation to the detriment of future occupiers and the character of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p>	<p>dwelling had off-street parking. The area was well served by bus routes and the type of location where residential conversions should be acceptable. The current B1 use had employed several people and operated without off-street parking. Peak parking for residential use might occur at a different time, but would be no more onerous than already existed. Impact on highway safety and residential amenity would be acceptable</p> <p>On [b] he commented that the development [already complete] was of a high standard. He found no policy guidance that dealt with outlook, or provision of amenity space for new dwellings. While outlook was restricted on one side, the other aspects for sunlight, daylight, and solar gain were excellent. Regarding provision of amenity space, he noted that Council design policies recognised that rigid standards can restrict creative design on awkward sites. In this particular case the benefits of bringing the upper floor of the property into beneficial use outweighed the absence of personal external space and outlook</p>
<p>P0090.11 68 Hog Hill Road Romford <i>Erection of new detached bungalow on land to rear of 68 Hog Hill Road with entrance off Browning Close</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of the subdivision of the existing rear garden of the host property appear isolated and result in amenity areas which are uncharacteristically small in comparison to the more spacious gardens along Hog Hill Road, harmful to the character and appearance of the area and contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The Inspector identified the following main issue [a] impact on the character and appearance of the area</p> <p>The Inspector said that the new dwelling would complement existing properties, and fit into the streetscene. The garden of both new and donor properties would be smaller than</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				Residential Design SPD.	<p>adjacent dwellings but would be adequate, in accordance with the Residential Design SPD, and would retain the general feel of spaciousness of other rear gardens. The development would satisfy DC61.</p> <p>He considered representations from nearby residents but was satisfied that off street parking was adequate and there would be no adverse impacts on highway safety, or the living conditions of neighbours.</p>
<p>P0087.11 16 - 18 Prospect Road Hornchurch <i>Outline application for demolition of No.s 16 & 18 Prospect Road together with "Sunset" and "The Bowery" and the erection of 11 dwellings with associated access and parking.</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would result in the unbalancing of the semi-detached dwellings at nos. 14 and 20 Prospect Road resulting in the remainder of the property appearing as a discordant and incongruous feature in the street scene and harmful to local character contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The application makes no provision to secure the provision of affordable housing within the development to the detriment of housing opportunities and social inclusion, contrary to the provisions of Policies DC6 and DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and Policy 3A.9 of the London Plan.</p> <p>The proposal fails to make adequate provision for the resultant additional school places required and as such fails</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector identified 2 main issues [a] impact on character and appearance of adjoining dwellings and the wider street-scene [b] whether suitable provision was made for "affordable" housing and educational facilities</p> <p>The proposal aimed to overcome an earlier appeal decision when it was decided that demolition of a single dwelling [half of a semi-detached property] would harm the street-scene; and access was unsatisfactory.</p> <p>On [a] the Inspector reflected that the original access proposal would have left an ungainly "other half" of the semi-detached unit as an incongruous feature in the street-scene. While the current proposal overcame that problem, the block either side of the access would be ungainly. They would each appear as unbalanced and incongruous features in the street-scene in conflict with policy DC61</p> <p>On [b] he found that the principle of</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>to make a contribution towards identified educational needs within the Borough to the detriment of social inclusion contrary to Policy DC29 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and Interim Planning Guidance for Educational Needs Generated by New Development.</p> <p>INFORMATIVES:</p> <p>The applicant is advised that were a resubmission to be made which satisfactorily dealt with reason for refusal 1 then a legal agreement would be sought to secure affordable housing within the development and an education contribution.</p>	<p>contributing to "affordable housing" seemed to be accepted. However the amount had not been settled and he had no completed Obligation before him. The development did not satisfy policy DC6. With regard to a contribution towards school places, the development was less than the threshold of 10 dwellings. Accordingly he gave the matter very little weight</p> <p>In response to resident concerns he commented that the height of the development [9.8 metres] in proximity to existing dwellings at 8 & 10 Prospect Road would have an overbearing and unacceptable impact on the rear gardens of those properties</p>
<p>P0508.11 R/O 25 Pettits Lane Romford <i>Outline planning application - for the erection of two bungalows r/o 25 Pettits Lane</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Committee</p>	<p>The proposed bungalows would, by reason of their height, bulk and mass, combined with the increased hard standing, 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 proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate provision of amenity space, result in a cramped over-development of the site to the detriment of future occupiers and the character of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector first clarified the matters he would consider. The appeal stated that Outline permission was sought together with approval of details of "appearance" and "landscaping". The original application had sought approval of different "reserved matters". Supporting documents referred to yet another approach. The simplistic drawings showed insufficient information to assess appearance and no information was provided about landscaping. In the absence of adequate detailed information, scale would also be reserved for future consideration. The only matter of detail he would take into account was that the development would be</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Development Control Policies DPD and Residential Design SPD.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of the new access road, result in noise and disturbance generated by new vehicular traffic, result in a sub-standard level of residential amenity for the occupiers of no. 23 and 25 Pettits Lane contrary to Policy DC61 of Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p>	<p>single storey.</p> <p>He identified 3 main issues [a] impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area [b] effect on living conditions of neighbours [c] impact on highway safety</p> <p>On [a] The inspector noted the area was characterised by semi-detached dwellings with long rear gardens. Views from the road showed glimpses through to trees indicating openness rather than development in depth. The bungalows would be set well back in the rear garden with no direct impact on the street-scene. But they would be visible from the access road; out of keeping with the pattern of frontage development; and an uncharacteristic and harmful intrusion into the established frontage. Close to Pettits Lane much of the existing frontage would be hardsurfaced to accommodate access and there would be little opportunity for meaningful landscaping. That would add harm to the streetscene. The proposal conflicted with policy DC61 and the SPD.</p> <p>On [b] he commented that dwellings were generally noise sensitive development rather than sources of noise. Neighbours may be aware of cadditional comings and goings, but the low volume of movements would not disturb residential amenity. However, he found that the bungalows would be very close to surrounding back gardens and were of a size that would have an unduly overbearing impact on outlook and enjoyment of those</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>gardens. There was no scope for effective screen planting. The development was contrary to policy DC61</p> <p>On [c] he noted that the highway was a Local Distributor Road. Emergency and service vehicles would be unable to turn within the site. However, attendance by emergency vehicles would be rare; refuse collection arrangements could be appropriately conditioned. The layout would provide adequate off-street parking. The development would satisfy policies DC36 and DC2</p>
<p>P0389.11 52 Heath Drive Gidea Park Romford <i>Single storey rear constervatory</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed rear extension would, by reason of its excessive width and height, be an intrusive and overly dominant feature on the rear elevation, contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The appeal raised the following issue [a] impact on the character and appearance of Gidea Park Conservation Area</p> <p>The proposal was for a rear conservatory comprising a glazed timber frame built on dwarf brick walls. The Inspector noted that adjoining dwellings, of similar design had already been extended to the rear and in 2 cases the extensions were of similar height and of much heavier construction.</p> <p>He noted that the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD guidance supported rear extensions up to 4 metres in depth [greater for conservatories of lightweight construction]. The conservatory would be visually subordinate to the main house. Given the width of the plot and the spacious gardens around it, there would be no adverse impact on the house, or its surroundings. The</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved in accordance with policy DC61
<p>P0164.11 59-61 Warwick Road Rainham <i>Change of Use to B2 (General Industrial) to carry out vehicle repairs</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate on site car parking provision and servicing arrangements, result in unacceptable overspill onto Warwick Road to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity and contrary to Policies DC33, DC36 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of the introduction of a noise creating activity, hours of operation and parking disturbance in close proximity to residential properties, result in an unacceptable loss of amenity of occupiers of Warwick Road, contrary to Policies DC55, DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of the introduction of a noise creating activity, hours of operation and parking disturbance in close proximity to residential properties, result in an unacceptable loss of amenity of occupiers of Warwick Road, contrary to Policies DC55, DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector identified the following issue [a] whether impact on residential amenity, traffic and parking could be mitigated satisfactorily.</p> <p>He noted that the premises was within a small group of industrial units at the end of a cul-de-sac. The site adjoined a dwelling; there were dwellings opposite; and the remainder of the cul-de sac was residential.</p> <p>He said that engine replacement/repair was often within Class B2 but could fall within Class B1 depending on working practices and measures to mitigate disturbance. But the application before him was for general B2 use. He said B2 use is not readily compatible with a residential area because of capacity to harm amenity.</p> <p>With regard to traffic generation and on-street parking, he commented that parking standards could be met within the site. He believed that the industrial units as a whole contributed to on street parking problems; to congestion from loading/unloading of vehicles; and disturbance from commercial vehicle movements, including during at unsocial hours. Similar activity might be expected whether the premises was used for B1 or B2 purposes. Traffic generation and on-street parking were not material</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>considerations.</p> <p>The Inspector considered planning conditions towards sustaining and encouraging industrial activity but concluded they could not overcome the inherent incompatibility between B2 processes and residential amenity.</p>
<p>P0214.11 15 Felstead Road Collier Row Romford <i>Retention of an existing boundary treatment at the front of the property</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The retention of the steel boundary fencing as proposed would, by reason of its excessive height and general appearance, be out of character with the surrounding area and highly prominent in the street scene. As such the development is considered to be inappropriate and harmful and fails to meet the aims and objectives of the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed</p> <p>The main issue in the appeal was [a] impact of the enclosure railings on the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The Inspector noted a variety of boundary treatments along the road. The essential character was low height that gave a sense of openness to the street. The railings would be higher but the slim profile and simple design maintained views across and through the enclosure. It was important that there were no gates in the railings. That also helped to maintained the character of ther area. He concluded the development was in accordance with policy DC61.</p>
<p>P0755.11 9 Links Avenue Romford <i>New porch canopy, two storey side extension, part single part two storey rear extension</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed two storey side extension by reason of its excessive width, bulk and mass lacks subservience and fails to respect the character, scale of the subject dwelling. As a consequence and mindful of the prominent location of the subject dwelling, the development will appear unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive in the street scene and thereby harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to the Residential Extensions</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The main issue in the appeal was [a] impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street-scene.</p> <p>Heobserved that the area was characterised by large detached houses set well back so that the road has a green and spacious feel to it. The extension would be a substantial addition that was both wide and deep and would transform the appearance of a</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				and Alterations SPD and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.	relatively modest property. Notwithstanding that, the resulting dwelling would not be out of character with the road. Design and detailing would complement the existing building. There would be some loss of openness but the relationship to boundary and adjoining properties would still be reasonable. The building would remain well set back and would not appear unacceptably dominant or intrusive in the street-scene. There was no conflict with policy DC61
<p>P0708.11 19 Balgores Crescent Romford <i>Single story rear extension - conservatory/garden room</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed rear conservatory, would by reason of its width, projection, design and materials, result in a development which would be detrimental to the special character and appearance of the Gidea Park Conservation Area, contrary to policies DC61 and DC68 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector identified the following issue [a] impact of the conservatory on appearance of the dwelling and Gidea Park Conservation Area</p> <p>The Inspector observed that the area was characterised by the variety of houses and by mature planting of streets and gardens. The appeal property was identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal as making a positive contribution to the area. The Appraisal also noted landscaped garden contributed significantly to the character of the area.</p> <p>The conservatory spanned virtually the whole width of the rear elevation and would be a dominant feature. While the gables broadly reflected the dwelling detailing would be unduly fussy and detract from the pleasing simplicity of the rear elevation. Use of UPVC would give a heavy feel to the structure and add to its adverse visual impact. The development would not preserve or enhance</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and failed to satisfy policies DC61 and DC68
<p>P0657.11 17 Tawny Avenue Upminster <i>Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion, new window to first floor front elevation and new windows and door to ground floor side extension</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed two storey side extension would, by reason of its increase in roof height would unbalance this semi-detached pair to the detriment of the streetscene and 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>The proposed development would, by reason of its position and proximity to the neighbouring property to the west, cause a loss of light which would have a serious and adverse effect on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector identified 2 main issues [a] impact of the development on 15-17 Tawny Ave and the wider streetscene. [b] impact on sunlight daylight and living conditions at 19 Tawny Ave.</p> <p>On [a] he observed that the loft conversion would involve a modest increase in roofline on one half of the sem-detached property. But the two rooflines were not juxtaposed; they were separated by the significantly higher main ridge of the building on both sides of the central chimney. The alteration would have some impact on symmetry of the front elevation of the pair but had no material impact on rhythm in the streetscene</p> <p>On [b] the Inspector noted there were windows in the side elevation of the adjacent dwelling 19 Tawney Ave. Squaring-off the roof would bring the building closer to No 19. The extension would breach the 45 degree line aimed at ensuring that side extensions do not cause undue loss of neighbours' light, contrary to SPD Guidance. The existing layout already limits sunlight to the windows, but the extension would make things worse and reduce natural light to the room. Light reflected from the white rendered extension wall provided insufficient mitigation. The proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the neighbours living conditions contrary to</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					policy DC61 and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD
<p>P0610.11 67 Park Drive Upminster <i>Two storey side and rear extension, single storey rear extension</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development, incorporating an excessively deep first floor rear extension and gabled end roofs would by reason of their design, bulk and mass fail to relate acceptably to the existing dwelling and would appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene, harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area. The development is therefore considered to be contrary to the London Borough of Havering Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Extensions and Alterations and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposed two storey side extension would, by reason of its excessive width, generally cramped appearance, bulk, mass and prominent corner location, represents an unsatisfactory design solution which would unbalance this pair of semi-detached properties and would appear unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive in the street scene harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to the Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Extensions and Alterations and Policy DC61 of the</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The main issue in the appeal was [a] impact of the extension on the host dwelling in its surroundings</p> <p>The Inspector observed that the gable elevations of adjacent dwellings were prominent in the street-scene. The proposal would change the overall appearance of the dwelling to a more emphatically gabled design that was broadly consistent with neighbouring properties. The new end elevation would be more substantial than the original but roofline of the rear extension would be lower than the main roof - the gain would be that its apparent mass, as seen from the street would be diminished by perspective. The large forward gable would partly obscure other elements of the front elevation so that the new extension would not be overly prominent.</p> <p>She remarked that there was considerable local variety in the treatment of frontages so that the circumstances of the appeal site were quite individual. The scale of extension was barely subordinate to the existing house but the plot was generous and the extended house would not be disproportionately large. On balance the Inspector concluded that the development would not result in material harm in the street-scene and satisfied the requirements of policy DC61</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The applicant is advised that in preparing any resubmission the following amendments would need to be considered:</p> <p>* The roof design of the two storey side and rear extension would need to be altered to a hipped roof design.</p> <p>* The overall scale and mass of the side extension would need to be reduced to allow a 1m set from the back edge of the footpath. In addition, the first floor of the side extension would need to be set back 1m to comply with Council guidelines and provide a subservient appearance.</p> <p>* The depth of the first floor rear extension should be reduced to no more than 3m</p>	
<p>P1770.10 3 Birch Road Collier Row Romford <i>Fencing to front boundary</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed boundary fencing would, by reason of its height and design, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene 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>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The appeal raised the following issue [a] impact on the streetscene and surrounding area</p> <p>The Inspector observed that Birch Road contained a variety of house designs. Generally front boundaries are marked by low walls fences or hedges up to 1m metre in</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>height. At each end of the road the returns are higher along the side and rear boundaries. The open railings would be 1.7 metres in height and would return along the mutual side boundaries with neighbours. The fence would not be consistent with the general character of the area. However, the Inspector considered that the height was mitigated when viewed against the higher side enclosures of the adjacent corner plot. The fence would be neither unacceptably dominant or intrusive in the street-scene and would not conflict with policy DC61</p>
<p>P0809.11 33 Harold Court Road Romford <i>Re-application of No. P0024.11 for single storey side extensions, rear extension and roof alterations, including front and rear dormers</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed roof alterations and extensions would, by reason of height, bulk, mass and proximity to the neighbouring boundaries, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive features in the streetscene and as an intrusive and un-neighbourly development to adjoining residential occupiers, harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area and residential amenity, contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector identified 2 main issues [a] Impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area [b] Impact on living conditions [sunlight and daylight] at 31 Harold Court Road</p> <p>On [a] he noted that the site lay within a row of detached bungalows, on sloping ground. The proposal would introduce first floor accommodation under a part-hipped roof. The dwelling would no longer resemble its near neighbours. Emphasised by the slope the enlarged dwelling would be an unduly dominant and intrusive in the street-scene and in conflict with the residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and policy DC61.</p> <p>On [b] the Inspector observed that the appeal site was at lower level than its neighbour at No 31. He was not satisfied that there was encroachment into the 45 degree line [identified in SPD] that was used to assess</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					sunlight and daylight to adjacent side windows, There was evidence the neighbour dwelling had been also been extended. That provided further mitigation of any light issues. There was no conflict with the SPD and policy DC61
<p>P0730.11 18 Thameshill Avenue Collier Row <i>Single storey rear extension</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed single storey rear extension would, by reason of its excessive depth, height and position close to the boundaries of the site, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers at 20 Thameshill Avenue, contrary to the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal raise a single main issue [a] impact on living conditions of neighbours with regard to over-dominance and loss of light</p> <p>The property was an end-terrace and a narrow gap divided it from the neighbouring property. Small changes in dimensions could have a significant impact on living conditions of neighbours. He concluded that an extension over the full width of the rear elevation and therefore along the common boundary, together with the height and pitch of the roof, would be overbearing and oppressive to neighbour amenity.</p> <p>The Council had also been concerned about loss of light to existing ground floor windows. The Inspector concluded that, taking account of the orientation of the buildings any such loss would not be significant and did not add weight to his decision</p>
<p>P0972.11 38 Hyland Close Hornchurch <i>Retrospective application for brick boundary walls with trellis and raised patio</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	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The appeal a single main issues [a] impact on living conditions of neighbours</p> <p>The Inspector noted that a previous appeal in relation to similar development had been dismissed because enclosure walls would be</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.	<p>overbearing and result in loss of outlook.</p> <p>In this case the boundary walls had been lowered and a trellis added. He said that trellis would significantly lighten the solid effect of the boundary walls and its impact on neighbours. The issue was whether the change would result in unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy. He said that some degree of overlooking had to be expected in urban residential areas and that a solution could be found that would strike an acceptable balance between loss of outlook and loss of privacy, among the various patterns for trellis fencing. A planning condition was appropriate.</p>

TOTAL PLANNING =

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

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/388/10/SX 5 Writtle Walk Rainham	Hearing				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal against the Notice was on the following grounds S174[f] that the requirements of the Notice are unreasonable and lesser steps would remedy harm caused by the development S174[g] that the time scale for complying with the Notice is inadequate</p> <p>In the Ground [f] appeal the appellant claimed that the Notice incorrectly required the premises to revert to Class A1 [retail] use. The Inspector explained that the issue was not a matter for him in the appeal but he extended the time scale for removing food preparation and kitchen equipment to 8 months so that the appellant could seek a Lawful Development Certificate [LDC] to establish planning use rights for the premises.</p> <p>In the Ground [g] appeal, the Inspector confirmed that the 1 month period for ceasing A5 use was reasonable. He formally increased the period for removing installations and equipment etc from 3 months to 8 months for the reasons set out above.</p>

TOTAL ENF = 1

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 20-AUG-11 AND 18-NOV-11

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<u>Summary Info:</u>					
Total Planning =		25			
Total Enf =		1			
Appeals Decided =		30			
Appeals Withdrawn or Invalid =		4			
Total =		26			
	Dismissed		Allowed		
Hearings	1	3.85%	2	7.69%	
Inquiries	1	3.85%	0	0.00%	
Written Reps	12	46.15%	10	38.46%	