

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

APPEAL DECISIONS - PLANNING					
Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P1070.12 37-39 Manor Road Romford <i>Demolition of an existing office, known as Service House, and erection of 5/6 storey block with 42 flats, with associated parking and gardens</i></p>	Hearing	Approve With Conditions	Committee	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its height, scale, obtrusive bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposal would, by reason of its scale, massing, bulk and layout result in an obtrusive and oppressive development adversely impact on the rear garden scheme and adversely impacting on outlook from neighbouring properties to the detriment of residential amenity, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposal would, by reason of an unacceptably excessive increase in traffic activity, result in harm to the living conditions of existing nearby residents through noise and congestion contrary to Policy DC61 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposal would, by reason of its design, including its form, external appearance and layout, not be of a sufficiently high quality of design and layout as to justify the excessively high density proposed, contrary to Policies DC2, DC3 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Design Supplementary Planning</p>	<p>Dismissed</p> <p>The proposal would be wider, higher and deeper than the existing building and occupy a greater proportion of the plot. The visual impact of the proposal would be significantly greater than the neighbouring building of its more prominent position in the street scene, the reduction in the existing wide gap between the existing blocks by largely filling it with five storeys of built form. The effect would be unduly dominant and oppressive and out of keeping with the scale of neighbouring development.</p> <p>Given its scale so close to the boundary, the building would appear unduly obtrusive from flats and gardens. The Inspector was not persuaded by the evidence provided that extra traffic would be likely to give rise to unacceptable noise disturbance to residents. The proposed development would have a materially harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with particular reference to outlook (but not in relation to privacy or traffic noise and congestion).</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>Document.</p> <p>In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to Policy DC72 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	
<p>P1005.12 R/O 150 Briscoe Road Rainham <i>Two bedroom detached bungalow</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its height and size and position in the existing rear garden of the host property and its residential design and appearance, appear as an incongruous feature in the rear garden environment and create amenity areas which are uncharacteristically small in comparison to the more spacious gardens in the surrounding area and would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and contrary to the NPPF, Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Design SPD. The proposal would make inadequate provision of amenity space for future occupiers of the development, which is directly overlooked by the donor property, and is poorly designed with habitable room windows facing directly on to boundary fencing, giving restricted light and outlook to the unit. The proposal therefore achieves a poor standard of design and residential</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The proposed bungalow would not look cramped within the site or appear overdeveloped. However a bedroom with a single obscured glazing window opening would result in unacceptable living conditions for future occupiers. The proposal would result in the neighbouring dwelling being hemmed-in by development and would be perceived as a harmfully oppressive presence.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>amenity and is therefore contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Design SDG.</p> <p>In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	
<p>P0598.12 223-225 St Marys Lane Upminster <i>Erection of a 40 bed residential care home for the elderly, associated amenity space, access, parking and a reconfigured seating area.-Outline</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Committee</p>	<p>The proposed care home would, due to its height, bulk, length of continuous frontage and closeness to its site boundaries result in a cramped form of development which would have an adverse impact on visual amenity in the streetscene and be overly-dominant in the rear garden environment contrary to Policies DC5 and DC61 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and SPD on Residential Design.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>It was considered that the proposal would not have materially harmful effects on neighbouring residential amenity. However the proposal has little regard to the height and scale of the adjoining residential properties, and would be taller than the neighbouring commercial building. It would have an unacceptably dominant appearance, which would be at odds with the existing street scene, due to its height, mass, relationship and close proximity to the neighbouring buildings.</p>
<p>P0272.12 Land adjacent Hare Lodge 487 Upper Brentwood Road Gidea Park Romford <i>Construction of a detached 2 storey dwelling.</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Approve With Conditions</p>	<p>Committee</p>	<p>Due to its poor siting and design the proposal would provide a cramped environment, out of character with the prevailing character of the local area and streetscene and would fail to preserve or enhance the Gidea Park Special Character Area, contrary to the NPPF and Policies CP18, DC61, DC69 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Design SPD.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The area has a suburban feel and forms part of the Gidea Park Special Character Area. The Inspector had strong concerns with regard to the design of a flat roofed building so close to donor property Hare Lodge would appear out of character with and consequently would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the GPSCA. Although Modernist architecture is evident in the area, these buildings are some distance away from the appeal site and do not directly</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its cramped layout and rear amenity space result in poor living conditions for future occupiers of the host property contrary to the NPPF, Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Design SPD.</p>	<p>relate to the area within which it is situated.</p> <p>The Inspector found that proposed development would not result in a cramped layout and an adequate area of private garden would be maintained to the rear of the host dwelling but these findings did not overcome the other issues</p> <p>An application for costs against the Council was refused as the Council did not behave unreasonably in determining the planning application and the reasons for refusal have been adequately substantiated with evidence.</p>
<p>P1416.12 Magala Southend Arterial Road Romford <i>Erection of one new dwelling</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Approve With Conditions</p>	<p>Committee</p>	<p>The proposal, by reason of its scale and siting, would result in a cramped and overly dominant development of the site, which would be harmful to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to Policy DC61 of the Development Control Policies DPD.</p> <p>The proposal would be insufficiently accessible to emergency vehicles during potential emergencies, to the detriment of the safety of the future occupier(s) of the dwelling, contrary to Policy 7.13 of The London Plan.</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The proposed dwelling has a contemporary design that would improve the appearance of the site. Most of the surrounding buildings are larger than the proposal and despite its proximity to two of the site boundaries; there would be no harm to the living conditions of the adjacent occupiers nor would it appear cramped or overly dominant. The Inspector considered that it was not demonstrated that the proposal would result in unacceptable access for emergency service vehicles and a satisfactory legal agreement was submitted by the appellant.</p>
<p>P1315.12 31 Lovell Walk Rainham <i>Two storey side/rear extension, single storey front and rear extensions</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>In the absence of a Section 106 Legal Agreement to ensure that the occupation of the annexe is controlled, the proposal is considered to be tantamount to a new dwelling. By</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The proposal is to provide annexe accommodation to the main dwelling for the appellant's mother. The Council considered the proposal is considered to be tantamount</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p><i>all in connection with a granny annexe ancillary to the function of the main dwelling house (Use Class C3)</i></p>				<p>reason of a lack of private amenity space, the development would be harmful to the living conditions of future occupiers together contrary to Policy DC4 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document together with the Design for Living Supplementary Planning Document. In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to Policy DC72 of the LDF and the provisions of the Draft Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	<p>to a new dwelling and that the sole inter-linkage could easily be removed through the bricking-up of the opening or not installing in the first instance. The Inspector considered that the Council was attempting to anticipate what may or may not happen in the future and this amounted to unsubstantiated assumptions. As the proposal is an annexe and not a dwelling, it would be unnecessary to provide a separate rear garden area for the future occupant/s.</p> <p>Finally there was no justification for requiring the appellants to provide a Planning Obligation towards the infrastructure costs associated with the development as the proposal was not forming a separate dwelling.</p> <p>An application for an award of costs was allowed. The Inspector found the Council had rested much of its reasons for refusal upon what it considered might happen in the future as opposed to determining the proposal for which the applicant has sought planning permission for. Therefore the Council acted unreasonably and the applicant incurred unnecessary expense.</p>
<p>P0749.12 Spencer Works Spencer Road Rainham <i>Demolition of existing, vacant, derelict industrial building and erection of 14x2-bedroom</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>Given the nature of the proposal, including its appearance, height, bulk, and massing in relation to the street scene, it is considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the character of the area, and that it would therefore be contrary to Policy</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The proposed development would sit far more acceptably in its visual context than the building replaced, and its construction would be a significant local environmental and visual improvement. The appeal proposal would impinge far less on neighbouring</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p><i>apartments together with ancillary car parking, bicycle storage and refuse storage areas and residents' amenity spaces.</i></p>				<p>DC61 of the LDF. Given the siting, layout, height, and overall scale of the proposal, particularly in relation to the rear curtilage of No.1A Spencer Road, it is considered that there would be a significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers particularly in relation to outlook. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF and the guidance contained in the Residential Design SPD. In the absence of a Section 106 agreement, intended to secure contributions towards local infrastructure costs, the proposal is considered to be contrary to the draft Planning Obligations SPD.</p>	<p>residents in terms of its visual impact than the existing building and for the same reasons, the outlook enjoyed from the neighbouring properties would improve. The Inspector concluded that the imposition of appropriate conditions would address concerns that the proposed development could harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents by reason of visual impact, outlook or privacy</p>
<p>P0650.12 35 Horndon Road Collier Row Romford <i>Roof extension, rear and front dormers, loft conversion and sub-division into 3 No. self-contained flats</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its inadequate provision of suitable private and easily accessible amenity space, have a serious and adverse effect on the living conditions of future occupiers, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. The proposal would, by reason of the cramped ground and first floor accommodation and lack of private amenity space for all units give rise to an overdevelopment of the site, which is out of keeping with the prevailing character of the surrounding area and</p>	<p>Dismissed The Inspector found deficiencies in the scheme in relation to access to amenity space, privacy and outlook. This would impact on future occupiers of the proposed flats resulting in unacceptably poor living conditions. Because of the additional pressure on infrastructure and services as a consequence of the new dwellings, a financial contribution would be necessary to make the development acceptable. No legal agreement was submitted to ensure that this is achieved.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				<p>gives rise to a poor quality living environment, contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document. In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	
<p>P0467.13 1 Church Lane Cottages Church Lane North Ockendon Upmintser <i>Fence to boundary</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed boundary failings, by reason of their height, design, length and prominent location would have a harmful impact on the existing verdant character of the boundary of the site and would be materially out of keeping in this rural location, materially harming the character and amenity of the locality and the North Ocekendon Conservation Area and contrary to Policies DC61 and DC68 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the provisions of the NPPF. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Amendments to the proposal were sought but were not considered to overcome the objections to the proposal. Given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than further negotiation, was in this case appropriate in</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The Inspector found the proposal; a lengthy set of railings, would introduce a distinct urban form into a rural setting in a prominent position within the North Ockendon Conservation Area. They would appear as a visually discordant and incongruous feature damaging to the visual qualities of the Conservation Area.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.	
<p>P1144.12 R/O 74 Western Road Romford <i>One person one bedroom detached bungalow</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its size and position on the existing rear garden of the host property, appear isolated, result in amenity areas which are uncharacteristically small in comparison to the more spacious gardens in the surrounding area and would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and contrary to the NPPF, Policy DC61 of the LDF Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Design SPD.</p> <p>The proposal would make inadequate provision of amenity space for future occupiers of the development. The proposal therefore achieves a poor standard of residential amenity and is therefore contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Design SDG.</p> <p>In the absence of a mechanism to secure a planning obligation towards the infrastructure costs of new development the proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Havering Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The proposal by reason of its layout and location fails to provide a suitably safe</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The siting of the proposal is at odds with the prevailing pattern of residential development in the area. Its siting, scale, height and form would have more in common with nearby outbuildings and incongruous in an area of otherwise ancillary or commercial uses. The small amount of external space provided, the plot would appear cramped and out of keeping. Finally the limited opportunities for natural surveillance of the property and the unlit access track to the site leave it vulnerable to crime.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				living environment, which is contrary to the objectives of community safety and contrary to Policy DC63 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document and the Residential Design SDG.	
<p>P0199.13 49 St Mary's Lane Upminster <i>Addition of first floor extension to create house together with infill extension at ground floor to side</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its excessive overall bulk, mass and extensive roof area, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development, which would be most oppressive and give rise to an undue sense of enclosure to the detriment of residential amenity especially those occupiers of Highview Gardens, 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. Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The proposal would unacceptably harm the living conditions of occupants of neighbouring ground floor flats. The increased height and expanse of flank wall and roof form would be materially harmful as it would dominate the outlook from kitchen windows of the flats.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>P1464.12 2 Hamlet Road Romford <i>Two storey rear and side extension</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its design, bulk and mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the street and 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. The proposed development would, by reason of its design and position close to the boundaries of the site, be an intrusive and unneighbourly development as well as having an adverse effect on the visual amenities of adjacent occupiers, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.</p>	<p>Allowed with Conditions The Council's main concerns related to the proposed mansard roof and its proportions. The appearance of the house would be significantly altered, the extension would sit acceptably in its visual context and the separation to neighbouring dwellings is sufficient to ensure that they would not suffer any adverse effects.</p>
<p>P0170.13 98 Crow Lane Romford <i>Proposed single storey rear conservatory extension and conversion of garage</i></p>	<p>Written Reps</p>	<p>Refuse</p>	<p>Delegated</p>	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its disproportionate depth, bulk and mass appear as a disproportionately large extension which is totally unrelated in scale and design to the subject dwelling and harmful to its appearance. Moreover, the development will appear as unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive within the garden scene and out of scale with its surroundings, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The proposed extension would, by reason of its excessive depth, height and position close to the boundaries of the site, create a "wall of development"</p>	<p>Dismissed The Inspector considered that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of the neighbours. However the mass of the extension, together with its design and appearance would have an unacceptable visual impact. It would be incongruous and out of keeping with the form and style of the original dwelling.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				which would be an intrusive and unneighbourly development as well as having an adverse effect on the amenities of adjacent occupier, No.96 Crow Lane contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.	
<p>P1489.12 124 Mildmay Road Romford <i>Installation of gates and railings to the front of the property</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its excessive height, scale and design, appear as an overly prominent and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene, harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.</p> <p>Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Improvements were required to make the proposal acceptable and suitable amendments were suggested during the course of the application, in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. The applicant declined to make the suggested revisions.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The predominant character in the street is that of consistently low front boundary walls of less than 1m high. The addition of tall walls and railings, would be harmful to the dominant character and appearance of the street scene and would fail to respond appropriately to its context.</p>
<p>P1475.12 72 Crowlands Avenue Romford <i>Single storey front and side extension</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	The proposed extension, by reason of its size and siting, would enclose the gap between the existing flank wall of the house and the site boundary and as a result, would appear unduly cramped, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene, contrary	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The extension would infill a distinctive gap between the flank wall and the highway boundary and would be prominent in views from Crowlands Avenue. It would fail to respect the existing balanced relationship with neighbouring properties appearing as an</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				to Policy DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD.	intrusive and incongruous feature on a prominent corner plot, harmful to the street scene.
<p>P0246.13 16 Burleigh Close Romford <i>Single Storey Extension to side of existing dwelling and Change of use of existing Garage to Study and Utility</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal, rather than negotiation, was in this case appropriate in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p> <p>The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate on site car parking provision, result in unacceptable overspill onto the adjoining roads to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity and contrary to Policies DC32 and DC33 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The standard for such a development is between 2 & 1.5 parking spaces. The driveway is short and it was not demonstrated that two cars could park clear of the road. Inadequate on-site car parking would likely result in overspill of parking onto the adjoining road. This would be detrimental to highway safety and additional on-street parking would create greater obstructions to road users</p>
<p>P1509.12 28 Gilbert Road Romford <i>Detached Garage</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>The proposed development would, by reason of its design and position close to the pavement, well forward of the established line of building within Gilbert Road, 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>Statement Required by Article 31 (cc) of</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Allowed with Conditions</p> <p>The front of the garage would be clearly visible within the street scene alongside an existing dwelling, a boundary fence to the Appeal property and against the backdrop of various trees and shrubs within the rear garden environment. Due to its siting, modest height and uncluttered appearance it would be perceived as a modest domestic building blending satisfactorily with the street scene & surrounding area.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
				the Town and Country Planning (Development Management) Order 2010: Improvements were required to make the proposal acceptable and suitable amendments were suggested during the course of the application, in accordance with para 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. The applicant declined to make the suggested revisions.	
<p>Y0014.13 74 Hubert Road Rainham <i>Single storey rear extension with a depth of 7m from the original rear wall of the dwelling house, a maximum height of 3.4m and a eaves height of 3m</i></p>	Written Reps	Refuse	Delegated	<p>This written notice indicates that the proposed development would not comply with condition A.4 of Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended by SI 2008 No. 2362 and SI 2013 No. 1101). It is important to note that this written notice does not indicate whether or not the proposed development would comply with any of the other limitations of conditions of Schedule 2 Part 1 Class A.</p> <p>The applicant has the right to an appeal against this notice to the Planning Inspectorate, see details overleaf. The proposal would not be permitted development</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The appeal concerns a type of prior approval application to determine whether the proposal for a 3m deep single storey extension is considered to comply with the permitted development criteria for residential houses. The two storey semi-detached dwelling already has a 4m deep extension and this would result in a total cumulative depth from the original rear wall of 7m. The legislation states that the enlarged part of a semi-detached house must not extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m. The scheme is not permitted development as it failed to comply with the criteria</p>

TOTAL PLANNING = 18

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
APPEAL DECISIONS - ENFORCEMENT					
Description and Address	Appeal Procedure			Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
ENF/363/10/HW Ashlea View Tomkyns Lane Upminster Alleged unauthorised gates and fence constructed within the Green Belt	Written Reps				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The enforcement notice is varied and subject to this variation the appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the proposal fell within the definition of a building and therefore was inappropriate development and by definition the development is harmful to the Green Belt. The boundary treatment, particularly the close boarded timber fence, would detract from the openness of the area and the visual amenity of the Lane. The appellant's concerns about security consideration did not outweigh the identified harm and there were not very special .circumstances to justify the inappropriate development.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<p>ENF/110/09/HW Suttons Farm Tomkyns Lane Upminster</p>	<p>Written Reps</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Quashed</p> <p>The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the raised patio and boundary treatments constituted inappropriate development in the Green Belt. During the course of the appeal, the fencing, walls, pillars and gates were reduced in height and a hedge was planted that screened the view of the fence from the lane. The Inspector identified very little harm to the openness of the Green Belt or to the purposes of including land within it and these considerations outweighed the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and as whole, very special circumstances exist which justify granting planning permission for the development.</p>
<p>ENF/203/13/HT Summerlea Noak Hill Road Romford</p>	<p>Written Reps</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> <p>The proposal to remove the tree is intended to increase off street parking for the appellant. The oak tree appeared to be in good condition with a full covering of foliage of normal size and colour and reasonably shaped crown. The benefits of removing the tree are not sufficient to outweigh negative impact of its loss particularly that there is no provision for the planting of a replacement tree.</p>

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
ENF/348/13/EM 4a Freeman Way Hornchurch	Written Reps				<p style="text-align: center;">Dismissed</p> The proposal is for the felling of a Monterey Pine. Although the tree is causing some unevenness to a driveway, this could be corrected and there is no evidence to support the claim that it is damaging a garage. The Inspector found that whilst the tree has an untidy shape this does not detract from its visual amenity and it is an important feature in the treescape in the area and its felling and replacement would be premature.

TOTAL ENF = **4**

LIST OF APPEAL DECISIONS MADE BETWEEN 27-JUL-13 AND 01-NOV-13

Description and Address	Appeal Procedure	Staff Rec	Delegated / Committee Decision	Reason for Refusal	Inspector's Decision and Comments
<u>Summary Info:</u>					
Total Planning =		18			
Total Enf =		4			
Appeals Decided =		22			
Appeals Withdrawn or Invalid =		0			
Total =		22			
	Dismissed		Allowed		
Hearings	1	4.55%	0	0.00%	
Inquiries	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Written Reps	15	68.18%	6	27.27%	