

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P0034.20

WARD : Hylands

Date Received: 14th January 2020

ADDRESS: 229 HORNCHURCH ROAD
HORNCHURCH

PROPOSAL: Replacement Boundary Walls, Railings and Gates

DRAWING NO(S): PL001 Revision D (19-229-4TP)
PL002 (19-229-4TP)

RECOMMENDATION : It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the reason(s) given at the end of the report

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a dental and implant centre. The area is predominantly residential in character. However there are a few commercial and retail units along the street.

There are several properties in the immediate vicinity with brick walls of varying sizes and styles.

The property is not a listed building and is not in a conservation area.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Part retrospective planning permission is sought for the existing double brick boundary wall and partly for proposed changes to that wall plus gates to the two entrances and railings above in some sections.

Wall height ranging from 1.19m to 2.3m.

RELEVANT HISTORY

A previous retrospective application for a similar proposal for boundary walls and gates was refused (reference number P0224.19) in April 2019 for the following reason.

The height of the proposed walls of the previously refused application was considered to be uncharacteristic of the area and the Highway Authority raised concerns against the potential impact on highway safety in terms of vehicles manoeuvring out of the adjacent site, particularly for the neighbor at no. 231 Hornchurch Road. It was concluded that the height of the proposed boundary wall would increase low visibility of passing pedestrians therefore the boundary wall was determined to be detrimental to pedestrian safety.

P0224.19 - Retrospective planning permission for front boundary walls, railings and gates.
Refuse 08-04-2019

P2230.04 - 2 No single storey rear extensions to accommodate dental surgeries. Glazed single storey front extension, glazed 2 storey front bay. New velux windows.
Apprv with cons 17-01-2005

P1782.04 - Erection of single storey rear extensions to accommodate dental surgeries; glazed single storey front extension lobby, glazed 2 storey replacement of front bay; new velux windows.
Refuse 17-11-2004

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

No objections were received during the notification period.

Internal consultations responses include:

- Street Management: The slightly lowered wall in certain sections of the fence is an acceptable improvement. However, if the wall on the neighbouring residential property is further lowered, it could enhance visibility as they exit their driveway.

- Waste and recycling: No domestic waste applies in this application.

RELEVANT POLICIES

LDF

DC33 - Car Parking

DC34 - Walking

DC61 - Urban Design

SPD4 - Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD

OTHER

LONDON PLAN - 7.4 - Local character

LONDON PLAN - 7.6 - Architecture

NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework

STAFF COMMENTS

The main considerations relate to the impact on the streetscene and the level of amenity afforded to neighbouring residents. It is also important to assess the implications for parking and highway safety.

It is noted that the previously refused application (P0224.19) proposed a boundary wall with a minimum height of 1.9m and maximum height of 2.3m. The main difference in the current proposal is that the previous design had a brick wall with a predominant height of 1.19m with railings above (partial visibility) increasing the height to 1.9m; whereas the current proposed plan has a brick wall with a predominant height of 1.19m and no railings above (except in one section by the residential neighbouring property). The columns and the gates were 1.9m as part of the previously refused application, but are 1.5m high in the current proposal. The new proposal removes one of the columns located on the corner with the neighbouring property at no.231 Hornchurch Road, which was considered to cause visibility issues in the previous scheme.

Advice was also given to the agent by an Officer regarding what was considered to be an acceptable height for the boundary wall, which was deemed to be maximum 1.5m height.

Overall the design is slightly reduced and consideration has been given regarding the safety concerns raised by Highways. It is noted that the proposal still exceeds the recommended 1.5m maximum height limit along the boundaries with adjoining neighbors (up to 2.3m high at no. 231 Hornchurch Road and up to 2m high by no. 2 Albany Road), but that the height is reduced to 1.5m closer to the egress of the driveways as they enter the highway (including a reduction in the height of the column at the corner).

The main concern to assess in this report is whether the proposed brick wall is appropriate and acceptable to mitigate safety concerns for cars entering and exiting the adjoining neighboring properties and whether it allows sufficient visibility of pedestrians and cars using the pathway and roads along Hornchurch Road and Albany Road. The visual impact to the street scene and character of the area has also been considered.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

Policy DC61 states that planning permission will only be granted for development which maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area.

The proposed boundary wall is a replacement of an old boundary wall of an approximate height of 1m. The boundary wall currently proposed would measure a minimum height of 1.19m and maximum height 2.3m as the land slopes towards the adjoining neighbouring site No. 231 Hornchurch Road.

Officers note that the general height of the front boundary wall is 1.19m with columns and gates at 1.5m height. In this case the proposed boundary wall will be introducing an uncommon height for boundary walls facing the highway. The proposed boundary wall due to its maximum height and double brick design would be an out of character development.

Overall the proposal would not integrate acceptably with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and is not policy compliant.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Both adjoining properties have garages and driveways at the point where the wall is proposed. Although there would be some impacts of overshadowing, loss of access to light and an increased sense of enclosure, given the immediate adjoining uses, it would not have a significant or undue amenity impact to the extent that would warrant a refusal.

Consequently, the proposal would not unacceptably impact on the amenity of the adjacent neighbours.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

Although the development would not result in a loss of parking in this area, concerns are raised against the potential impact on highway safety in terms of vehicles manoeuvring out of the adjacent site. It is concluded that the height of the proposed boundary wall would increase low visibility of passing pedestrians therefore the boundary wall is detrimental to pedestrian safety.

Furthermore the Highway Authority have raised concerns against the proposal in relation to this matter.

As such the proposal would fail to meet the provisions of policy DC34 of the London Borough of Havering LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD 2008.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

The proposal is judged to adversely affect the character of the property and the street scene and would have detrimental impacts to highway safety.

It is therefore recommended that a REFUSAL is granted.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the following reason(s):

1. REFUSAL - Street scene

It is considered that the proposed boundary wall would by reason of its height and design appear incongruous to the street scene contrary to policy DC61 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD Adopted 2008, and the Adopted Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2011.

2. Reason for refusal - Highway Safety

The proposed development would by reason of it excessive height reduce the visibility of pedestrians against emerging vehicles from No.231 Hornchurch Road. As such the proposed development would be contrary to policy DC34 of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD Adopted 2008, and the Adopted Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2011.

1 Refusal - No negotiation

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal and the reason(s) for it is given to Robert Humphreys on 24 April 2020.

Authorising Officer: Habib Neshat
--

27-04-2020
