

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

APPEAL DECISIONS - PLANNING					
Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P0764.11 land adjacent 20 Surridge Close Rainham <i>Erect 2 x two storey houses with extending the access road to provide on site parking</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would, due to its height combined with its gabled roof form and siting in close proximity to the shared boundary with No.s 2 and 3 Mayfield Close, result in the proposal being a cramped, visually intrusive and overly dominant form of development causing loss of outlook and a strong sense of enclosure adversely impacting on residential amenity, contrary to Policies DC3 and DC61 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Design.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed</p> <p>There are two main issues in this appeal. The first is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area. The second is its implications for the living conditions of the surrounding residents, particularly those living within Mayfield Grove. The appeal site is presently part of the rear garden of 16 Glebe Road and an adjacent grassed area located at the eastern end of Surridge Close. The proposal involves the erection of a pair of semi-detached houses as a continuation of the housing on the south side of Surridge Close.</p> <p>The design of the proposed houses would tend to reflect the existing pattern of development in Surridge Close maintaining continuity within the cul-de-sac. The density of development would not be out of character with the area and could not reasonably be described as unacceptably cramped. The Inspector on the issue of character and appearance concluded that it would generally be in keeping with the prevailing character of the area and the street scene within Surridge Close.</p> <p>On the second issue, the Council concerns related to the effect of the scheme on the amenity of No's 2 and 3 Mayfield Grove. The Council considered that the scheme would constitute a visually intrusive and overly dominant form of development which would</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>create a strong sense of enclosure and loss of outlook to the adjoining residents.</p> <p>The flank elevation of the house proposed adjacent to the east boundary would create an oppressive sense of enclosure to the occupiers of 2 Mayfield Grove. It would significantly impinge on the residents' outlook from the rear of their house and small garden. The dominating impact of the development would also be apparent to the occupiers of 3 Mayfield Grove, despite its more oblique relationship to this particular property. In the view of the Inspector, the scheme would amount to an unneighbourly form of development which would significantly harm the living conditions of these residents due to its dominating impact.</p>
<p>P0939.11 218 Moor Lane Cranham Upminster <i>Conversion of existing outbuilding into one bed bungalow dwelling</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The conversion of the existing outbuilding into a new dwelling would, by reason of its design, appearance, roof form, height, scale, bulk and proximity to the boundaries of the site, appear as an incongruous and unacceptably cramped overdevelopment of the site, to the detriment of local character and the streetscene contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The conversion of the outbuilding into a new dwelling would result in an overbearing, intrusive and out of character feature within the rear garden environment harmful to the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring residential</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed</p> <p>The main issues in this appeal were firstly the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and secondly, the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers. The final reason is whether acceptable living conditions would be provided for future occupiers.</p> <p>The appeal proposal is for conversion of existing outbuilding into a two bedroom bungalow dwelling and would involve fundamental changes to the appearance or size of the existing building. There would be a</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>properties contrary to policy DC61.</p> <p>The conversion of the outbuilding into a new dwelling would, by reason of its position close to the boundaries of the site, would result in a poor living environment for future occupiers of the proposed development, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies DPD and the aims of PPS1.</p>	<p>subdivision of the existing garden into two smaller plots. A variety of plot sizes and shapes are evident in the vicinity of the site and the plot width within the Fairholme Gardens street scene would not result in a cramped or results in a congested layout. The Inspector concluded that there would be no harm character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The building already exists and a change of use of the existing building would result in an overbearing or intrusive impact on neighbouring properties even though it is relatively close to the rear boundary. As there would be no upper floor windows and there would be 1.8 metre fence to the rear and side boundaries which would mitigate any perceived of loss of privacy. New planting would further screen the proposed dwelling from the garden of the host property.</p> <p>On the final point, the proposed amenity space provided appropriate boundary Treatments were constructed would be private and of sufficiently usable area to serve the proposed dwelling. However in looking at the internal layout, the sole bedroom window, as well as the French doors to the kitchen/dining/living room, would both be little more than 2m from the existing 1.8m tall close-boarded boundary fence. This would be the primary outlook for the main areas of habitable accommodation and would result in the interior being dark and oppressive. This would not provide appropriate living conditions for future occupiers.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>M0004.11 Public highway at junction of North Hill Drive & Whitchurch Road Harold Hill, Romford <i>Installation of a twin user 10 metre street furniture column with shared antennas located within a glass reinforced plastic shroud at the top. With 1 no. shared ground based equipment cabinet and ancillary development thereto.</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its height, bulk of the top section and prominent, elevated siting have an adverse impact on visual amenity in the street scene and on the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers, contrary to Policies DC61 and DC64 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The appeal is allowed and the decision is noted</p> <p>The appeal related to refusal of an application in respect of development by a telecommunications code system operator for the siting and appearance of a 10 metre high mast with antennas and a ground based equipment cabinet. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.</p> <p>The appeal proposal would be located at the back of the pavement at the junction of two roads. The column would be seen primarily in the context of the North Hill Drive street scene. North Hill Drive is a wide suburban road, flanked on both sides by substantial trees in the highway verges. The trees, along with street lighting columns staggered along both sides of the road, exceed the height of the street's mainly 2-storey houses.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that there is already a notable element of vertical features in the street scene, with the skyline being regularly broken and punctuated. The proposed column would not be so tall as to sit uncomfortably within the general visual mix of trees and street lighting, even in winter months and would occupy a gap in a run of existing street lighting columns of a similar height. In summary it was found that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>In respect of the living conditions of occupiers of Newstead House, the presence of the proposed column would be no different to that of the range of existing street lighting, signage, and other street furniture. It would not have any significant effect on the outlook from Newstead House, and therefore there would be no material harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. The appellant provided an ICNIRP certificate confirming that the proposed equipment would meet the Government's guidelines, and concerns raised by third party objectors regarding public safety were insufficient to justify dismissing the appeal on health grounds.</p>
<p>P1358.11 218 Moor Lane Cranham Upminster <i>conversion of existing outbuilding into a two bedroom bungalow dwelling, canopy porch and bay window</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The conversion of the existing outbuilding into a new dwelling would, by reason of its roof form, height, scale, bulk and proximity to the boundaries of the site, appear as an incongruous and unacceptably cramped overdevelopment of the site, to the detriment of local character and the streetscene contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The conversion of the outbuilding into a new dwelling would result in an overbearing, intrusive and out of character feature within the rear garden environment harmful to the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties contrary to policy DC61.</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The appeal is allowed and the decision is noted</p> <p>The main issues in this appeal were firstly the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and secondly, the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers. The final reason is whether acceptable living conditions would be provided for future occupiers.</p> <p>The appeal proposal is for conversion of existing outbuilding into a two bedroom bungalow dwelling and would involve fundamental changes to the appearance or size of the existing building. There would be a subdivision of the existing garden into two smaller plots. A variety of plot sizes and</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>The conversion of the outbuilding into a new dwelling would, by reason of its position close to the boundaries of the site, would result in a poor living environment for future occupiers of the proposed development, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies DPD and the aims of PPS1.</p>	<p>shapes are evident in the vicinity of the site and the plot width within the Fairholme Gardens street scene would not result in a cramped or results in a congested layout. The Inspector concluded that there would be no harm character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The building already exists and a change of use of the existing building would result in an overbearing or intrusive impact on neighbouring properties even though it is relatively close to the rear boundary. As there would be no upper floor windows and there would be 1.8 metre fence to the rear and side boundaries which would mitigate any perceived of loss of privacy. New planting would further screen the proposed dwelling from the garden of the host property.</p> <p>On the final point, the proposed amenity space provided appropriate boundary Treatments were constructed would be private and of sufficiently usable area to serve the proposed dwelling. The internal layout and windows would result in a more open outlook from the main habitable rooms in comparison to the alternative scheme dismissed on appeal. The flank wall window to the living/kitchen/dining room would provide aspect over the private garden area and provide living conditions in the main living space to an appropriate standard. The dual-aspect larger bedroom would have an open aspect to the front from its bay window. The proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P0627.11 30a South Hall Drive Rainham <i>Subdivision of a two bedroom dwelling into 1 x 1 bedroom self contained flat to the ground floor and 1 x 2 bedroom self contained flat to first and second floors</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of the particularly remote provision of amenity space and likely noise and disturbance associated with the proximity, layout and size of the proposed parking court, result in a substandard level of residential amenity to the detriment of existing and future occupiers and the character of the surrounding area contrary to Policies DC4 and DC61 and Residential Design SPD.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of the excessive hardstanding of the proposed front parking court area and the lack of space for either soft landscaping or refuse storage facilities associated with the proposed flatted development, result in harm to visual amenity in the streetscene harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policies DC4 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD, Residential Design SPD and Landscaping SPD.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The main issues this appeal were the effect of the proposed development, firstly, on the living conditions of its occupiers and those of the attached properties on either side of the appeal property and secondly, on the character and appearance of the local area. The appeal property is a 2-storey mid-terrace house and the proposal is to convert it into two self-contained flats. The proposed ground floor flat would have direct access to, and dedicated use of, the modest-sized rear garden. The new 2-bedroom flat would occupy the first and second floors of the appeal property and be served by a small area of private amenity space located at the side of the short terrace of which No 30A forms part.</p> <p>The proposed amenity space serving upper floor flat would be remote and, as a result, inconveniently located for its future occupiers, which would severely limit its value to them as attractive and useable external space. If the occupiers wanted use the proposed space for drying clothes could involve carrying wet clothes from the kitchen at second floor level down two flights of stairs and around the side of the terrace building. Moreover with no obvious natural surveillance from within flat 2, occupiers may also be reluctant to leave personal belongings within the proposed space or use it for children's play without direct supervision. It is therefore contrary to council guidance on this matter as it is advised that every home should have access</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>to suitable amenity space.</p> <p>The proposed living room/kitchen window of flat 1 would face onto the area for vehicle parking in the front of the terrace. The view from this habitable room would include parked vehicles or, in their absence, an expanse of parking area. The guidance in the Council's SPD states that habitable rooms should have at least one window with an adequate outlook. Additionally there would also be the prospect of noise and disturbance to future occupiers of the ground floor flat caused by vehicles using the spaces immediately in front of the terrace and manoeuvring, engines left running, and car doors slamming. On the amenity issue the Inspector concluded that the proposal would not provide satisfactory living conditions for its future occupiers.</p> <p>On the character issue, most of the space in front of the terrace would be used for vehicle parking. A total of eleven spaces would serve the three units in this terrace and irrespective, because of its apparent scale, the proposed parking area would visually dominate the setting of the appeal building in marked contrast with the present layout. Views of the proposed parking area would be possible from various public vantage points along South Hall Drive and that additional planting would not satisfactorily mitigate the visual impact of the proposed parking area. In conclusion the Inspector found that the parking area would be visually obtrusive in the local street scene and out of keeping with</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					the local area.
<p>P1892.10 14 Beverley Gardens & rear of 8, 10, 12, 16, 18 Beverley Gardens Hornchurch <i>Demolition of No. 14 Beverley Gardens, the formation of new access road and footpath and erection of four dwellings with four car ports (outline)</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposal, by reason of its density, size, scale, bulk and siting, would be unacceptably cramped in relation to surrounding development and the spacious rear garden character and appear overbearing to the detriment of the amenities of adjacent residential occupiers and the spacious, mature landscaped part of this part of the Emerson Park Policy Area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Emerson Park Policy Area Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The main issues in this appeal were the effect of the proposed development, firstly, on the character and appearance of the local area; and secondly, on the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby residential properties. The site lies within a residential area with semidetached and detached dwellings set in generous plots with spacious, mature landscaped rear gardens which are typical of this part of the Emerson Park Policy Area.</p> <p>The proposal was an outline application to demolish and remove 14 Beverley Gardens and erect four detached dwellings and carports on the land that currently forms part of its rear garden and parts of neighbouring rear gardens. The proposal would introduce a substantial built form into generally undeveloped garden space. Having viewed the site from properties that back onto the site, the Inspector considered that proposed built form would appear as a visually disruptive and uncharacteristic intrusion into relatively long and generally open garden space.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the proposed layout arrangement would appear unduly cramped. Narrow gaps would separate the flank walls of these new dwellings and their</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>position would be fairly close to the rear boundaries of some surrounding properties. Consequently, there would be limited space between new dwellings on at least two of their sides. The modest depth of the front gardens of plots 1 and 2 would also give the impression that these new units occupy restricted plots, thereby reinforcing the perception that this is a cramped form of development that would not be assimilated easily into this mature landscaped area</p> <p>The proposal would not integrate satisfactorily into the more spacious pattern of existing development, in which houses generally have deeper front gardens with gaps that are perceived to be wider between adjacent buildings proposed. In summary the proposal would add an unwelcome and visually intrusive element to the local area to the detriment of its character and appearance.</p> <p>On the second issue, elements of the new development would be visible from nearby properties as some of the proposed dwellings would be located close to the rear boundaries of surrounding houses. Such views would be limited by existing vegetation and because of the separation distances to the rear of existing houses. Consequently, the Inspector found that the proposal would not cause any significant loss of privacy through overlooking or loss of light to nearby properties.</p> <p>The new buildings would be evident from the rears of properties in Channing Close and Beverley Gardens even with the low profile</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>design of the proposed dwellings. The chalet style bungalows on plots 3 and 4 would be likely to be significant in height and include substantial blank walls close to and facing the rear gardens of dwellings in Beverley Gardens. The single storey bungalow on plot 1 would be likely to be evident to the occupiers of 3 Channing Close, located just beyond its rear boundary, together with the taller built form of the dwelling proposed on plot 2.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the proximity of the built form close to the rear gardens of existing properties would represent such a significant change that it would result in an over-dominant impact on the occupiers of the surrounding properties. This would be harmful to neighbouring residents' living conditions because it would result in an undue loss of outlook.</p>
<p>P0737.11 Abbottswood Nursing Home 21 Gilbert Road/ 11 Kingston Road Romford <i>Demolition of bungalow (11 Kingston Road) and two garages at rear. Erection of part two storey & part single storey extension as enlargement of existing nursing home - containing 13 no.</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its design, height, bulk and mass forward of the Gilbert Road building line, 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 first floor windows facing no. 13 Kingston Road cause overlooking and loss of privacy which would have a serious and adverse effect on the living</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The main issues are the effect of the proposal, firstly, on the character and appearance of the local area; and secondly, on the living conditions of its occupiers with particular regard to private amenity space and privacy.</p> <p>The site occupies a prominent corner plot at the junction of Kingston Road and Gilbert Road, and lies within a predominantly residential area. The proposal would demolish and remove the existing bungalow</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p><i>bedrooms and wetrooms ensuite, plus kitchen, dining room and office</i></p>				<p>conditions of adjacent occupiers, contrary to 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 no. 13 Kingston Road result in an overbearing impact in a rear garden environment and loss of privacy which would have a serious and adverse effect on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposed garden area overlooks the sole window for bedroom 6 of the extension, resulting a loss of privacy which would have a serious and adverse effect on the living conditions of any potential future occupier, 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 the amenity of future occupiers and the character 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>and garages that partly occupy the site and extend the existing nursing home primarily to provide additional accommodation.</p> <p>The proposal would result in a substantial enlargement of the site. The extended building would give the appearance of a continuous built form, albeit varying in height and roof form, along much of, and close to, the highway frontage. This layout would sit uneasily with the more spacious pattern of existing development nearby in which smaller residential buildings generally have shorter highway frontages and are set back from the road.</p> <p>The considerable scale, bulk and position of the proposed extensions close to part of the site's boundary with Gilbert Road, would cause it to appear cramped in terms of layout, especially when viewed from the Kingston Road and Gilbert Road junction. Additional planting would not satisfactorily mitigate its impact.</p> <p>On the second issue, the proposed private amenity space to serve occupiers of the appeal scheme would be largely enclosed with tall walls on three sides and a substantial fence on the fourth. This arrangement, coupled with the modest size of the proposed space would not provide an attractive and useable external space because the outlook from within the space would be poor and users would experience a sense of enclosure.</p> <p>On the matter of privacy, users of the amenity</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>space would be able to look directly into the sole window for one of the proposed bedroom. As a result, there would be a significant loss of privacy for the occupiers of this room. The use of curtains or blinds would not be effective in mitigation since they would have to remain closed while the space was in use.</p>
<p>M0005.11 land at junction of Wingletye Lane and Essex Gardens Hornchurch <i>Installation of a 10m streetworks type column accommodating 6No. shrouded antennas, shared equipment enclosure, meter cabinet and development ancillary thereto</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed telecommunications mast would, by reason of its height and prominent location, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area contrary, to policies DC61 and DC64 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The main issue in this appeal was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.</p> <p>The proposed mast would be located on part of a grass verge that lies close to the junction of Wingletye Lane and Essex Gardens. It would be sited very close to the highway and at some 10m in height, would be materially higher than nearby street lighting columns, telegraph poles and roadside signs.</p> <p>The proposed mast would be evident in the local street scene and would stand forward of the main front building line of properties along Wingletye Lane and higher than the single storey dwellings to the south of the site. It would also be visible from various public vantage points in Wingletye Lane and Essex Gardens. The proposed mast would stand out because it would occupy a prominent position and its height and appearance would markedly contrast with other features within the local area adding urbanising clutter. Its impact would be partially mitigated by the slim</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>design of the pole. However painting the pole a different colour to that proposed would not mitigate this harm.</p> <p>Although there was an accepted need for the proposal, and there was a lack of suitable, alternative sites, and no significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties, the Inspector was not persuaded that these other material considerations outweighed the identified harm to the character and appearance of the local area.</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The main issue in this appeal was the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.</p> <p>The proposed mast would be located on part of a grass verge that lies close to the junction of Wingletye Lane and Essex Gardens. It would be sited very close to the highway and at some 10m in height, would be materially higher than nearby street lighting columns, telegraph poles and roadside signs.</p> <p>The proposed mast would be evident in the local street scene and would stand forward of the main front building line of properties along Wingletye Lane and higher than the single storey dwellings to the south of the site. It would also be visible from various public vantage points in Wingletye Lane and Essex Gardens. The proposed mast would stand out because it would occupy a prominent position and its height and appearance would</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>markedly contrast with other features within the local area adding urbanising clutter. Its impact would be partially mitigated by the slim design of the pole. However painting the pole a different colour to that proposed would not mitigate this harm.</p> <p>Although there was an accepted need for the proposal, and there was a lack of suitable, alternative sites, and no significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties, the Inspector was not persuaded that these other material considerations outweighed the identified harm to the character and appearance of the local area.</p>
<p>A0057.11 Former Plough PH Gallows Corner Colchester Road Romford <i>2x 96 sheet advertisement displays-illuminated</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed advertisement displays would, by reason of their height, length, illumination and siting, 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 and DC65 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the London Plan Policy 7.4.</p> <p>The proposed advertisement displays would, by reason of their siting and illumination, be likely to give rise to a distraction to drivers to the detriment of highway safety contrary to Policies DC61 and DC65 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The appeal is allowed and the decision is noted. The main issues in this case are the effect of the advertisements on the visual amenity of the area, and public safety on the highway.</p> <p>The appeal site comprises the derelict, burnt former Plough Public House which is surrounded by hoardings. The site lies within a mixed area of residential, commercial and retail uses clustered around the major junction of the A12, A127 and the A118. The area is visually dominated by the road junction and the adjoining fly-over.</p> <p>The temporary advertisements would enable a new means of screening along the</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				Development Plan Document.	<p>Colchester Road site frontage to be erected. The signs would be seen principally by road users approaching the junction from the north-east. This part of the highway is already dominated by the highway direction signs and the large retail fascia signs on the opposite side of the road. The proposal would not be out of scale or character with these existing features of the street scene. The proposal would be lower than the fascia signs on the opposite side of the road and would not be overly dominant or visually intrusive within its context against the former Pub building.</p> <p>In regard to highway safety, the main concern was the possible distraction to drivers approaching the junction that might arise from the illuminated advertisements. It was noted that the A12 is straight and well lit at this point with ample forward visibility. The Inspector however did not find that this was a particularly hazardous location or that the proposed traditional, static display would necessarily distract drivers.</p>
<p>P1283.11 Land rear of 9-13 New Road Rainham <i>Proposed erection of block to incorporate 4No flats(revised application to P0893.10)</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposal would, by reason of its excessive height, bulk, massing and close proximity to boundaries, represent a cramped overdevelopment materially out of keeping and adversely affecting visual amenity in the street scene and otherwise open character of the locality contrary to Policies DC61 and DC2 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document.	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The appeal is allowed and the decision is noted. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the local area and its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings.</p> <p>The appeal site sits at the back of a terrace of three properties fronting New Road which have been converted to 6 flats and at the rear</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>The proposal would, by reason of close proximity to adjoining residential development, result in the development being visually intrusive to existing occupiers contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p>of a row of terraced dwellings within Mardyke Close. The site currently accommodates a commercial building and the proposed building would be a much larger structure that would abut the open Green Belt land to the west known as Beam Parklands.</p> <p>The proposed building would in its design and overall appearance would be compatible with that of surrounding dwellings and its ridge height would be viewed at a similar height, given the topography of the land. It would front from the west against the backdrop of the properties of New Road and Mardyke Close, which are of a broadly similar scale. The density of the proposed development would marginally exceed the Council's recommended density levels for this part of the borough. The Inspector concluded that it would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the local area.</p> <p>In regard to the effect on the living conditions, the Inspector noted that the proposed building would be much further from the rear elevation of the dwellings of Mardyke Close than the end of the terrace which fronts New Road. The side elevation of the proposal would be 11m from the New Road buildings and is comparable with relationships between existing built form in New Road and Mardyke Close. In conclusion, the Inspector was satisfied that the development proposed would not harm the outlook for the occupiers of nearby dwellings and nor would adversely affect the privacy of these dwellings.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P1006.11 19A Seymer Road Romford <i>Variation of existing condition ref ES/ROM/199/51 in order to use for place of worship and other activities</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposal, by reason of its location, the nature of the existing site, and the intended use, would have a serious and adverse effect on the amenities enjoyed by occupants of neighbouring property in particular and the surrounding area generally, by reason of noise, disturbance and pedestrian and vehicular activity at and within the vicinity of the site and would be contrary to Policies DC33 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The proposal would lead to an unsatisfactory development of the site with inadequate car parking arrangements and drop off and loading facilities, and so would be likely to give rise to additional indiscriminate kerbside car parking at and within the vicinity of the site, which in turn would be detrimental to the safety of both vehicles and pedestrians, and would be contrary to Policy DC33 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The main issue in this appeal was the effect the proposed uses (as a place of worship and for children's parties, etc. i.e. Planning Use Class D1 in full) would have on residential amenities and parking conditions in Seymer Road.</p> <p>The Inspector noted that, in principle, the proposed uses are not incompatible with a residential area; however there were specific concerns because of the proximity of the site to houses and because of the parking conditions in Seymer Road. The site is flanked by residential dwellings and the use of it for the proposed activities would be noticeable to the occupiers of these houses. This is because of the sound of people arriving and departing and vehicular movements and parking near to the site boundaries. This would be exacerbated if the activity results in noise that is audible outside the building or takes place at unsociable hours.</p> <p>It was noted that there are parking restrictions on Seymer Road and almost all the residents have converted their front gardens into parking areas. Moreover there is also competition for on-street parking spaces from visitors to the commercial premises near the Seymer Road/North Street junction.</p> <p>Up to 60 people at a time could attend the premises if used as a place of worship and the Inspector considered that activities on this</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>scale could take place here without creating unacceptable disturbance to residents and a demand for parking spaces that could not be satisfactorily accommodated within the site. Furthermore the types of uses were also likely to result in noise being generated within the premises that is audible beyond the site boundaries and they may take place at times when residents would expect the neighbourhood to be quiet.</p>
<p>P1870.11 44 Herbert Road Emerson Park Hornchurch <i>Demolition of existing bungalow, construction of 6 detached dwellings with associated vehicle access and landscaping</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Approve With Conditions</p>	<p>Committee</p>	<p>The proposal, by means of the number and size of dwellings and the arrangement of garden space around them, would represent a cramped overdevelopment of the site, out of keeping with the spacious setting of the surroundings properties and street scene and therefore harmful to the character and appearance of the Emerson Park area, contrary to the Emerson Park Policy Area SPD and Policies DC61 and DC69 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed</p> <p>The main issue in this appeal was the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the street scene, with particular reference to the Emerson Park Policy Area (EPPA). The appeal site is comprised of a single detached dwelling on a large plot, much of which is covered with overgrown planting and a Tree Preservation Order applies to trees on the site. The site is located in EPPA, which is typified by medium and large dwellings located in spacious well landscaped grounds. It is noted that the EPPA is divided into six sectors and there is planning guidance which is designed to provide both a level of control over developments throughout the area and also to provide specific criteria for the various sectors within the area, each of which has its own character.</p> <p>The Inspector firstly noted that the existing</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>building is largely screened from the road by extensive planting, but contributes to the general sense of space in the street scene due to the plot width and the separation between buildings. The proposal would open views of the site through gaps between retained mature trees, and as such the buildings to the rear of the proposed frontage houses would have an impact on the street scene and the wider area. Given the presence of other cul-de sacs in the vicinity, the principle of this pattern of development would not conflict with the aims of Council's policies and Supplementary guidance.</p> <p>The Inspector noted that backland development can result in reduced rear garden lengths, and although the proposal includes garden sizes which are large enough to meet the functional needs of future occupants of these large houses, they would not be long when viewed in proportion to the footprint of the houses themselves. The result of the siting of six dwellings of the footprints proposed on the appeal site would be that none would be perceived as having a particularly spacious plot.</p> <p>There are 2.5 and 3-storey dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site, but Inspector agreed with the view, that the proposed dwellings would be overly large for their plots and this would be exacerbated by the height and scale of the dwellings set between mainly primarily two-storey housing. The proposed dwellings would fail to respect the scale, massing and height of the surrounding</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>physical context contrary to policy DC61</p> <p>The appellant highlighted that The Lombards, a neighbouring cul de sac contains detached houses in 'modest' plots. However the proposed plots would be smaller still than those in The Lombards and elsewhere in the immediate vicinity of Sector 6 of the EPPA. The Inspector considered that the proposed dwellings would appear unduly close together within the appeal site and to boundaries, to an extent that the overall effect would be that of an excessive amount of development compared to the general pattern in the vicinity. A comparison by the appellant to the denser housing layouts within nearby Sector 5 was not accepted as valid as it was not appropriate to apply the same standards throughout the EPPA and it would not take into account of, and would undermine the distinction between the sectors. In summary the Inspector concluded that the proposal would fail to maintain or enhance the special character of the EPPA, and would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and wider area.</p>
<p>A0051.11 St Peters Church Gubbins Lane Harold Wood Romford <i>Post mounted notice board- illuminated</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Approve With Conditions</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>Compliance with the five standard conditions as defined in regulation 2(1) and set out in schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning: (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007</p> <p>The maximum luminance of the free standing sign hereby permitted shall not exceed 85 cd/m2.</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. This appeal stems from application A0051.11 for which the council granted express advertisement consent. The appellant however appealed against one of the conditions which restricted the hours in which the illuminated signage would operate. The sole issue in this appeal is the effect of</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Reason:-</p> <p>To comply with the recommendations of the Institute of Public Lighting Engineers Technical Report No. 5 (Third Edition) in the interests of amenity, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC65</p> <p>The illuminated signage hereby approved shall be fitted with a timer to ensure that the signage is not illuminated between the hours of 9pm and 7am (the following day) on any day without the prior consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason:-</p> <p>To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control in the interests of amenity, and in order that the development accords with the LDF Core Strategy Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61 and DC65</p> <p>INFORMATIVE:</p> <p>Reason for approval:</p> <p>The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the aims, objectives and provisions of Policies DC61, and DC65 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p>	<p>the extended hours of illumination of the signage on public amenity</p> <p>The church sits between buildings in community use in a predominantly residential area, and sits opposite residential dwellings in Gubbins Lane which is a busy main road with considerable traffic activity. It was noted that there was general evening activity in the area and included light from traffic signage and street lighting. The illumination of the signage late into the evening would in the Inspectors opinion would result in a significant visual intrusion to residents opposite and in the vicinity of the appeal site to a degree that would be harmful to public amenity.</p> <p>The reasoning for this was that although the nearest dwellings are on the opposite side of the road, this distance would not prevent nuisance arising from the lighting. Despite its luminance level and minimal noise, this would not mitigate the sense of intrusion. It was accepted that the church does have activities that take place beyond 21.00 hours, but operation of the illumination until midnight, or 23.30 hours as offered by the appellant in the appeal, would materially affect the amenities of nearby residential properties. The proposed hours of operation would result in a more continued intrusion than other public light sources in the vicinity, which are required in the interests of public safety rather than for advertisement.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Note: Following a change in government legislation a fee is now required when submitting details pursuant to the discharge of conditions, in order to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications and Deemed Applications) (Amendment) (England) Regulations, which came into force from 06.04.2008. A fee of £85 per request (or £25 where the related permission was for extending or altering a dwellinghouse) is needed.</p>	
<p>A0067.11 119 Rainham Road Rainham <i>KFC advertisement scheme</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Part Approve/Part Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>Compliance with the five standard conditions as defined in regulation 2(1) and set out in schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning: (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007</p> <p>The maximum luminance of the signage hereby permitted shall not exceed 800 cd/m2 for each individual sign.</p> <p>Reason:-</p> <p>To comply with the recommendations of the Institute of Public Lighting Engineers Technical Report No. 5 (Third Edition) in the interests of amenity, and in order that the development accords with the Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC65</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the approved plans, particulars and specifications.</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The Council issued a split decision in which express advertisement consent was granted for (A) Illuminated Signage. The appeal relates only to the refusal of the totem sign and the main issue in this case was the impact of the totem sign upon the character and appearance of the locality.</p> <p>The appeal site is situated near the junction of Cherry Tree Lane and Rainham Road and is located in part of the Cherry Tree Corner Major Local Centre. Street furniture and advertising is not uncommon in the locality and the proposal would introduce a blade totem sign standing some 4m high into the street scene.</p> <p>The blade design, bold red colours, and internal illumination, would ensure that it would stand out and draw the eye from many vantage points along the road upon which it</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Reason:-</p> <p>The Local Planning Authority consider it essential that the whole of the development is carried out and that no departure whatsoever is made from the details approved, since the development would not necessarily be acceptable if partly carried out or carried out differently in any degree from the details submitted. Also, in order that the development accords with Development Control Policies Development Plan Document Policy DC61.</p> <p>INFORMATIVE:</p> <p>1. Reason for approval</p> <p>The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the aims, objectives and provisions of Policies DC61 and DC65 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>Note: Following a change in government legislation a fee is now required when submitting details pursuant to the discharge of conditions, in order to comply with the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications and Deemed Applications) (Amendment) (England) Regulations, which came into force from 06.04.2008. A fee of £85 per request (or £25 where the related</p>	<p>was sited and from the road junction. The Inspector stated that it was reasonable to assume that it would alert passers-by from all directions, to the presence of the business. It would be at odds with the character of the locality where commercial signs are predominantly understated. Appearing as an incongruous addition to the street scene it would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the locality.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>permission was for extending or altering a dwellinghouse) is needed.</p> <p>The proposed blade totum sign 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 and DC65 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	
<p>P0162.11 1 Aquarend Place St Mary's Lane Upminster <i>Erection of one industrial unit and demolition of existing timber storage shed</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 out of character in the locality and harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area within the Metropolitan Green Belt, contrary to Policies DC45 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The site is within the area identified in the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Development Plan Document Policy DPD as Metropolitan Green Belt. Policy DC45 and Government Guidance as set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (Green Belts) 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. No</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The main issues is this appeal are whether the proposal is inappropriate development within the Green Belt, whether the proposal would affect the openness of the Green Belt and if the development is inappropriate, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances.</p> <p>On the first issue, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that the replacement of a building need not be inappropriate, provided that the new building is in the same use and is not materially larger than the one it replaces. The proposed building would be materially larger than the building to be replaced in terms of height and footprint. Therefore it would constitute inappropriate development that is, by</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>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.</p>	<p>definition, harmful to the Green Belt and, in conflict with the aims of the NPPF and Council policy DC45.</p> <p>On the second issue, the appeal site is located in an area of sporadic residential and commercial development located within open land. Buildings including the travelling show people site next to the appeal plot are visible in the landscape however the area has a general sense of openness. The replacement of the existing building and all containers in a single footprint would result in a significantly bulkier building which would materially reduce openness at the site, which would undermine the Green Belt setting.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the development would be harmful to the GB by reason of inappropriate development, but that there would be additional harm arising from the effect of development of the scale proposed on its openness. The proposal would conflict with the aims of the NPPF policy DC45 and also policy DC61 as it would fail to maintain or improve the character and appearance of the local area due to its scale, massing and height.</p> <p>On the final issue of other considerations in favour of the proposal, it was noted that commercial need is a factor which, in principle, weighs strongly in support of the appeal proposal. However, during the site visit, it was evident that the existing storage building was being used for boat storage. The Inspector did not doubt that purpose-built</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>secure storage would be beneficial to the operation of the business, but the submitted evidence does not demonstrate that a building of the size proposed is required to meet an essential need.</p> <p>The appellant advised that 4 - 5 staff would be employed within the new building, but the evidence did not indicate that there would be any increase in staff, and limited weight was given to the potential for employment generation arising from the proposal. In summary the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist, and for the reasons outlined above, the appeal was dismissed.</p>
<p>P1812.11 36 Glenton Close Romford <i>Single/two storey side/rear extension</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its excessive width, bulk and mass, unbalance the appearance of this semi-detached house and 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 DPD.</p> <p>Informative</p> <p>The applicant is advised that in preparing any resubmission that the overall width, scale, bulk and mass of the development would need to be reduced to ensure the development provides a more subservient appearance.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area. Glenton Close is located within a residential estate characterised by semi-detached and short terraces of two-storey dwellings on modest sized plots. No 36 is paired with No 35 and is in a prominent position on the corner with Glenton Way.</p> <p>The Inspector noted that the proposed extension would be nearly 4m wide and this would be too wide when compared to the width of the existing front elevation and would appear to be out of proportion to the original house. The footprint of the extension and the</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>extent and complexity of the proposed roof would not respect the scale of the house or its simple design. The overall size and bulk of the extension would appear to dominate, rather than being subservient to, the house and would not integrate with it satisfactorily.</p> <p>The prominent corner position of the appeal site means that the proposed alterations would be highly visible from the surrounding street scene. It would seriously disrupt the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached properties, which would be harmful to the street scene in this particular location. The proposed extension would encroach into the space between the existing flank wall and the wall that encloses the garden. This would introduce a sense of enclosure on the approach to the junction, disrupting its symmetry and adversely affecting the wider street scene. The flank wall of the proposed extension would also protrude beyond the building line of the properties on the eastern side of Glenton Way, failing to respect the existing layout of the estate.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of this pair of semi-detached properties and the surrounding area</p>
<p>P1735.11 94 Carter Drive Collier Row Romford <i>Two storey side & single storey front extensions</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its width, 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</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area and</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate on site car parking provision, result in unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity and contrary to Policy DC33 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD</p>	<p>secondly whether the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss in the provision of off-street parking.</p> <p>The appeal property is a semi detached dwelling located on a corner plot. It has a glazed porch with a hipped roof that has been added to the front elevation. The proposal is to construct a two-storey side extension with a single storey element across the full width of the front of the house.</p> <p>The extension would be 4.5m wide, bringing the overall width of the house to 10m. The Inspector found that this would be a disproportionate increase in the size of the dwelling. As a result its overall bulk and mass would appear to dominate the host property and this would be accentuated by the single storey element that would extend across the full width of the ground floor. The proposed extensions would essentially change the appearance of the front of the house and disrupt the existing balance and symmetry of this pair of semis. This would be harmful given its prominent position in the street scene.</p> <p>On the parking issue, the proposal would necessitate the removal of a garage. Council guidance states that where proposals for side extensions result in the loss of on-site parking they will be acceptable if adequate provision is made elsewhere within the curtilage of the property. The Inspector considered that the provision of one space on the site would be acceptable without creating problems for</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					highway safety or inconveniencing local residents. This however was not sufficient reason to outweigh the conclusions in relation to the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
<p>P0032.12 106 Haynes Road Hornchurch <i>Single storey rear extension raising of roof and rear dormer window</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed rear dormer window would, by reason of its excessive height, width, bulk and mass, is unrelated to the existing dwelling and would appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the rear garden scene, 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 rear dormer window would, by reason of its excessive size, French doors and Juliette balcony, close to the boundaries of the site, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupiers contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The main issues in this appeal were the effect of the proposed development firstly on the character and appearance of the area and secondly on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.</p> <p>The appeal property is an L shaped bungalow with a wing projecting forward at the front. The appeal proposal is for a single storey rear extension, attic conversion with roof alteration to facilitate rear dormer. The modest change to the height of the bungalow and the change to a gable ended roof would not be harmful. However, the dormer extension would be a very bulky feature that would extend across almost the whole of the rear of the house. It would completely alter the character of the dwelling when viewed from the rear as the original roof form would largely obscured. The extension would also be to the rear and prominent in views of the rear of the property from the gardens of neighbouring properties. On this issue, the Inspector considered that the width height and mass of the proposal would fail to respect the form of the existing building.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>On the living conditions issue, the proposed double doors with Juliette balcony would result in some overlooking of the neighbouring rear garden. It was noted that there is significant planting along the site boundary and overlooking of rear gardens from neighbouring properties is not unusual in an urban setting. On this point the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm. This however did not outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the local area.</p>
<p>P1934.11 188 Moor Lane Cranham Upminster <i>Single storey side extension to both flanks and single storey rear extension</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 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 is allowed and the decision is noted. The Inspector noted that works have been partly completed and partly remained under construction. The main issue raised in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the street scene. The appeal property is a detached chalet bungalow fronting Moor Lane with a side return to Laburnham Gardens. The character and appearance of the area is of a wide variety of well spaced, single and two storey dwellings. The appeal property is set well back from its Moor Lane frontage.</p> <p>The addition of a window to the front elevation of the single storey extension would be set sufficiently far back within the site that it would scarcely be noticeable from Moor Lane. Therefore there would be no harm to the street scene. The proposed flank extension along the return to Laburnham Gardens has been set in from that boundary. It extends further to the rear than the existing</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>building, but not beyond the rear line of the conservatory. Given its low scale and design, including its roof design, it was considered that there would be adequate open spacing to the rear and to the front of the extension to ensure that it would not appear over dominant in the street scene and respect the character of well spaced dwellings in the local area.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the scheme, taking both its individual elements as well as taken all together, does and would not harm the street scene.</p> <p>The appeal is allowed and the decision is noted. The Inspector noted that works have been partly completed and partly remained under construction The main issue raised in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the street scene. The appeal property is a detached chalet bungalow fronting Moor Lane with a side return to Laburnham Gardens. The character and appearance of the area is of a wide variety of well spaced, single and two storey dwellings. The appeal property is set well back from its Moor Lane frontage.</p> <p>The addition of a window to the front elevation of the single storey extension would be set sufficiently far back within the site that it would scarcely be noticeable from Moor Lane. Therefore there would be no harm to the street scene. The proposed flank extension along the return to Laburnham Gardens has been set in from that boundary. It extends further to the rear than the existing building, but not beyond the rear line of the conservatory. Given its low scale and design,</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>including its roof design, it was considered that there would be adequate open spacing to the rear and to the front of the extension to ensure that it would not appear over dominant in the street scene and respect the character of well spaced dwellings in the local area.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the scheme, taking both its individual elements as well as taken all together, does and would not harm the street scene.</p>
<p>P0006.12 Rydal Mount North Road Havering Atte Bower <i>Retention of decking area</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The decking area, by reason of its excessive depth, width and height is an intrusive and insensitive development contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document</p> <p>The decking area, by reason of its design, bulk and height, results in an unsympathetic, visually intrusive development which does not preserve or enhance the special character of this part of the Conservation Area contrary to Policy DC68: Conservation Areas of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document</p> <p>The site is within the area identified in the Havering Unitary Development Plan as Metropolitan Green Belt. The Unitary Development Plan and Government Guidance as set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (Green Belt) is that in order to achieve the purposes of the Metropolitan Green Belt it is essential to retain and protect the existing rural</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The appeal is allowed and the decision is noted The appeal was related to an application for retrospective planning permission for a decking area. The main issues raised in this appeal are firstly whether the building would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and secondly its effect on the openness of the Green Belt and on the character and appearance of the local area and any other harm.</p> <p>The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling on the north-west side of North Road, with residential properties on either side. The land slopes down from the front to the back of the site, and beyond the long garden is open countryside. The property lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>The decking area, as built, extends to the full width of the property but leaves an open gap on either side to the property boundary. The use of wood for the decking and balustrade</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>character of the area so allocated and that residential additions will only be permitted where they do not constitute a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The decking constitutes a disproportionate addition to the built up form of this property and is therefore contrary to Policies contained in PPG2 and DC45 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p>	<p>allows the decking to blend into the garden landscape. In the Inspector's opinion, it is seen as part of the garden rather than as a further addition to solid, built development on the site.</p> <p>One of the essential characteristics of the Green Belt is its openness and in this Context the Inspector did not find that the decking area, given its scale and use of natural materials, including the open balustrade, would harm the openness of the Green Belt and therefore the development was not found to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>On the second issue, the extent to which the land has been made up to ensure a level surface did not appear visually intrusive within the garden in the Inspector's opinion. It was not considered that the decking area is visually intrusive or represents over development of the site or that it harms the character and appearance of the local area through an urbanising effect.</p>
<p>P0031.12 26 Wallenger Avenue Gidea Park Romford <i>Two storey side and rear extensions and single storey front and rear extensions</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed two storey side extension by reason of its scale, bulk, roof form and proximity to the boundary would infill the space at first floor level between the application dwelling and its neighbour giving rise to a cramped appearance which is uncharacteristic to the Gidea Park Special Character Area and harmful to street scene. For this reason the extension is considered to be contrary to the aims and objectives of</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and also on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwelling. The proposal is for the demolition of an existing conservatory to the rear and its replacement with a two storey extension to the rear and side of the dwelling</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, Policy DC61 and DC69 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposed two storey side and rear extension would, by reason of its excessive width, 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 the Neighbour at No. 28 Wallenger Avenue contrary to Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policies DC61 & DC69 - LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The two storey side/rear extension would, by reason of its excessive width; height, bulk and mass appear as an unacceptable dominant and visually intrusive feature in the rear garden contrary to Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and Policies DC61 & DC69 - LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p>	<p>and a single storey extension to the front.</p> <p>On the first issue, the Inspector considered that the proposed extension would be to both the side and the rear. The extension to the side would significantly alter the built form narrowing the gap between the dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling. This would result in a very cramped relationship with No.28 because of its width and depth. The proposed extension would simply extend the line of the front elevation at ground and first floor levels to the side and it would not appear subservient to the existing dwelling. The extensions would give the dwelling a much more bulky appearance and would add substantially to the bulk of the dwelling. The cumulative effect of the extension when seen from both the front and the rear would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>On the second issue, the proposed extension would greatly restrict the outlook from the side facing window of the kitchen/dining room at neighbouring house No.28. The proposal would greatly restrict the amount of daylight to the side window making the room substantially darker than it is already and giving a very overbearing outlook which would be harmful to the living conditions of the neighbouring dwelling.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P1748.11 216 High Street Hornchurch <i>Demolition of existing day room and study to the side of the property and construction of double storey side extension including the enlargement of the existing below ground garage</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed side extension would, by reason of its excessive width, position close to the boundaries of the site, front projection and overall design, result in visual harm to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the openness and spaciousness of the site, having an adverse impact on the character of the street scene and this part of the conservation area, contrary to Policies DC61, DC68 and DC69 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of its design and appearance, result in unsympathetic, visually intrusive development which would not preserve or enhance the special character of this part of the Conservation Area contrary to Policies DC68 and DC69 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the provisions of PPS5.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of its position and proximity to neighbouring properties cause overlooking and loss of privacy which would have a serious and adverse effect on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The main issues are the effects of the proposed development firstly; on the St Andrew's Conservation Area and whether it would preserve or enhance its character or appearance and secondly; on the living conditions of nearby residents in terms of overlooking. The appeal site is a detached 2-storey dwelling with an existing ground floor flat roofed side extension. A below ground level garage is situated under the extension.</p> <p>The appeal proposal is for a 2-storey pitched roofed side extension replacing the existing extension, and for the enlargement of the garage underneath. The proposed extension by reason of its height would be substantially more prominent in the street scene, notwithstanding the brick wall and timber gates on the High Street frontage of the appeal property. The Inspector considered that the 2-storey extension would with its increase in roof height and prominent hipped gable would add considerable bulk to the building and give it a discordant asymmetrical appearance to the front of the building. The proposed extension would therefore harm the character and appearance of St Andrew's Conservation Area.</p> <p>On the second issue, the proposed extension would be adjacent to a small block of flats. There would be two first floor windows on the rear elevation, one is a bathroom and the other is a bedroom. The bedroom window would be set away from the common</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>boundary and any overlooking of this area from this window would be at an angle. In any event the garden is a communal area overlooked already by those flats with first floor windows and the angle of the bedroom window to windows at the flats would prevent any material loss of privacy for their occupants. On this matter, it was concluded that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of nearby residents in terms of overlooking. However, this did not outweigh the conclusions on the first issue.</p>
<p>P1179.11 13 Melstock Avenue Upminster <i>Two storey side extension</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its unsatisfactory roof design, fail to relate acceptably to the appearance of this detached property. Moreover, due to the close proximity of the development to the public highway, the proposal would appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street scene. The development is therefore harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The site comprises a two-storey detached house on the corner of Melstock Avenue and Coniston Avenue. The proposal is for a two-storey part-depth side extension that would align with the rear elevation of the building.</p> <p>It was noted that the footprint of the proposed extension would be significantly closer to the highway boundary than the 1m minimum spacing advised in the Council's SPD (a guidance document for extensions and alterations). The extension would also sit forward of the building line in Coniston Avenue, contrary to the advice of SPD, however the side elevation of the existing house already lies in front of this line. In the</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>Inspectors view, given the significant distance between the rear of appeal site and the first house in Coniston Avenue would be sufficient, not to be significant.</p> <p>The extension would intrude into the open space that is a characteristic of this corner plot. It would be a prominent feature in the street scene that would dominate views along the road. Its proximity to the boundary would be likely to necessitate partial removal of the hedge to facilitate construction, thus further exposing the extension to view. The Inspector therefore concluded that the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p>
<p>P0186.12 39 Elmhurst Drive Hornchurch <i>First floor side extension</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>1. The proposed development would, by reason of its height, orientation and proximity to neighbouring properties cause an unacceptable loss of light, which would have a serious and adverse effect on the living conditions of the adjacent occupier, No 41 Elmhurst Drive, 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 style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed and the decision is welcomed The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of residents at No 41 Elmhurst Drive in terms of possible loss of light. The appeal property is a semi-detached 2-storey dwelling which has been previously extended at ground floor level to the side and rear.</p> <p>The Council's guidance on Residential Extensions and Alterations states that side extensions will not be permitted where they break a 45 degree line taken from the sill of a primary original window serving a habitable room on the outside wall of an adjoining house. The appeal property is to the south of</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>the neighbouring property and it was accepted by the appellant that the proposed extension would encroach the 45 degree line from the kitchen window and, due to its orientation, would reduce the amount of sunlight entering that window.</p> <p>The Inspector visited the neighbouring property and determined that the side window was the primary window in the room. It was noted that the light reaching the side window is already limited by the blank wall of an existing single storey extension. In the view of the Inspector, the height, orientation and proximity of the proposed extension would be such that and there would be a significant reduction in both sunlight and daylight reaching the side window. The proposed extension therefore would have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of residents of the neighbouring property.</p>
<p>P0270.12 2 Avon Road Upminster <i>Demolition of existing outbuildings and construction of a two storey side and part single storey side and rear extensions and internal alterations</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would be an intrusive and unneighbourly form of development, which would be oppressive, dominant, overbearing 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>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The appeal is allowed and the decision is noted</p> <p>The main issue in this case is the effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. The appeal property is a gable fronted semi-detached house with a gap to its side boundary and parking to the front. To its west side is a corner property located in Hall Lane which has been substantially extended on its Avon Road frontage. The Council raised no objections to the design and form of the extension. Due to the set back of the first</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
					<p>floor of the extension and the Inspector agreed that it would appear subservient to the main dwelling. Its design would also suitably relate to the existing building and be in accord with the character of the area.</p> <p>The Council's main concern related to the impact of the extension on the rear garden environment. A section of the side wall of the appeal property would be brought much closer to the boundary of a neighbouring property and its rear garden. The impact of this flank wall would be reduced by its set back from the boundary. An outbuilding at the appeal site which rises above the fence line would be removed. The roof of the two storey part of the extension would be hipped away from the boundary and therefore, at this level its impact would, again, be reduced. Overall, whilst the side wall of the extension would result in a greater enclosure, the Inspector did not think this would be overpowering or unduly harmful to this rear garden area with its open southerly aspect</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the appellant demonstrated that, due to the orientation of the properties, the proposed extension would have only a limited impact in terms of over shadowing of the courtyard area of a neighbouring garden, with the effect being restricted to the early morning period. In summary the proposal would not unduly harm the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers by reason of being oppressive, over dominant, overbearing or creating any undue sense of enclosure.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments

TOTAL PLANNING =

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
APPEAL DECISIONS - ENFORCEMENT					
Description and Address	Appeal Procedure			Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>ENF/306/09/EM County Service Station Essex Gardens Hornchurch</p>	<p>Written Reps</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed, planning permission is refused and the notice is upheld. The decision is welcomed. The appeal relates to a former petrol filling station situated on the south side of Essex Gardens at the junction of Wingletye Lane. The surrounding area is mainly residential in character although the site is located in small enclave of commercial premises which include a vehicle repair workshop to the east and a small shopping parade.</p> <p>The Council's reasoning for serving the Enforcement Notice is that the car wash and valeting business has harmed the amenities of neighbouring residents as a result of noise and disturbance. The appellant appealed against the notice on ground A which is that planning permission should be granted for breach of planning control alleged in the Enforcement Notice. There were two main issues in this case. The first is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the surrounding residents and the second is its effect on the highway conditions.</p> <p>The appellant argued that noise levels from the use are comparatively insignificant compared to the activities at the vehicle repair workshop. However, no evidence in support of this argument, such as a noise assessment was provided. The noise from the car wash and valeting business has created significant disturbance to residents living in the vicinity, especially those opposite in Essex Gardens. The noise produced</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>ENF/306/09/EM County Service Station Essex Gardens Hornchurch</p>	<p>Written Reps</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>comes from high pressure washers 'blasting' water onto cars and from vacuum cleaners that are used for long periods, which intrudes on the enjoyment of the house and its gardens. Furthermore a procession of vehicles passing through the washing/ valeting area and the general hubbub of activities upon the site is likely to be intrusive to residents in the vicinity.</p> <p>The Inspector noted the relationship of the site to its surroundings including residential dwellings and the fact the use is conducted in the open. Although planning conditions were suggested by both the Council and the appellant, the Inspector considered that these would not adequately mitigate the noise and disturbance arising from the use. In summary it was found that the car wash and valeting business significantly harms the living conditions of surrounding residents due to noise and disturbance.</p> <p>On the second issue, the Council's considered that the car washing and valeting activities had resulted in on-street parking along Essex Gardens and Wingletye Lane, to the detriment of road safety and the free flow of traffic. The appellant did set out how the car wash operated but did provide any detailed information concerning the typical throughput of vehicles on an hourly or daily basis. The Inspector noted that if the business proved to be successful, then the capacity of the site to accommodate customer and staff vehicles might be</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>ENF/306/09/EM County Service Station Essex Gardens Hornchurch</p>	<p>Written Reps</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>exceeded at certain times and it would be unlikely that customers would be turned away. It was also noted that there is a parking problem in the area due to the shops and local schools and the indication from representations including London Buses is that the car wash business adds to this problem and has caused additional on-street parking. The Inspector concluded that the continuation of the business would exacerbate the parking and traffic congestion that occurs at certain times in the vicinity of the nearby road junction and the bus stop in Essex Gardens. The appeal was dismissed, planning permission was refused and the enforcement notice was upheld without correction or variation to its requirements.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>ENF/421/10/EL 11 Ryder Gardens Hornchurch</p>	<p>Written Reps</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal is dismissed, planning permission is refused and the notice is upheld. The decision is welcomed. The appeal relates to a two storey semi-detached property situated in a mainly residential area. The Council discovered during September 2010 that the property was not being used in accordance with the terms of planning permission P0574.09 granted in September 2009 for 'Part change of use of existing dwelling into day nursery for up to 12 children with three carers (opening hours: 8:00am-6:30pm Mon-Fri)'.</p> <p>The first floor was being used as part of the day nursery, whereas the application drawings indicated this would be retained as residential accommodation. A retrospective planning application (P1328.10) for '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' was refused in November 2010. A planning appeal was dismissed on 12 September 2011.</p> <p>The appellant appealed against the notice on ground A which is that planning permission should be granted for breach of planning control alleged in the Enforcement Notice. There are two main issues in the appeal. The first is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents, particularly in terms of noise and disturbance. The second is its effect on the prevailing highway conditions in the area.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>ENF/421/10/EL 11 Ryder Gardens Hornchurch</p>	<p>Written Reps</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The planning merits of the unauthorised use of the property were effectively addressed by the Inspector who dismissed a planning appeal in September 2011. The Council considered that there had been no material change in planning circumstances in the six months from the previous appeal decision. The Inspector in the Enforcement Notice agreed entirely with the conclusions reached in the planning appeal.</p> <p>Representations of local residents highlighted that noise and disturbance arising from the use of the property continues to be a significant problem and the intrusive impacts of the unauthorised use have continued unabated. The Inspector concluded the scale of the nursery use has seriously harmed the living conditions of nearby residents due to noise and disturbance. The use is conflict with Council policy for community facilities which seeks to ensure that these do not have a significant adverse affect on residential amenity of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>On the second issue, the Council argued that there is inadequate provision on the site for off-street parking and an absence of drop off points for parents, which leads to an unacceptable level of on street parking, increasing congestion in the area and harming road safety.</p> <p>The appellant submissions did not provide any firm evidence to indicate the traffic generation associated with this use is</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>ENF/421/10/EL 11 Ryder Gardens Hornchurch</p>	<p>Written Reps</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>minimal. The appellant did not provide a Transport Plan or any other evidence to demonstrate the majority of trips associated with the use involved the use of sustainable modes of transport. The planning merits relating to the highways issues were also addressed by the Inspector who dismissed a planning appeal in September 2011. The Inspector in this Enforcement Notice again agreed entirely with the conclusions reached in the planning appeal. In summary it was concluded that the use contributes to parking and traffic congestion in the vicinity of the road junction and the surrounding area, thereby leading to an unacceptable deterioration in the local highway conditions.</p> <p>The appellant also argued that lesser steps would overcome the harm caused by the use however the arguments put forward appear to address the planning merits of the development. The Inspector did not agree that lesser steps would not remedy the breach of planning control. The appellant argued the period given to comply with the notice was too short and that the time for compliance with the notice should be extended to 6, 12, 18 or 24 months. This would give the appellant more time to allow all the parties involved to make alternative childcare arrangements. No compelling evidence was provided to show that even a 6-month period would be necessary to allow alternative arrangements to be explored. The Inspector agreed that a 3 month period for compliance with the notice was a</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
ENF/421/10/EL 11 Ryder Gardens Hornchurch	Written Reps				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> proportionate and reasonable response to the breach of planning control. The Inspector dismissed the appeal, refused planning permission and upheld the enforcement notice with a correction and a variation to one of the requirements of the notice.

TOTAL ENF = **2**

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 19-MAY-12 AND 17-AUG-12

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 =			2		
Appeals Decided =			28		
Appeals Withdrawn or Invalid =			1		
Total =			27		
	Dismissed		Allowed		
Hearings	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Inquiries	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Written Reps	20	74.07%	7	25.93%	