



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by R Dickson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

Appeal Ref: 6000342

17 King Edward Avenue, Havering, Rainham RM13 9RH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Hill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0336.25.
 - The development proposed is described as “demolish the existing one bed single storey dwelling and construct a two storey two bedroom property”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (a) the character and appearance of the area, and (b) the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers, with specific regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. King Edward Avenue contains a mix of detached and semi-detached bungalows, dormer bungalows and 2 storey houses. While the architectural styles and roof designs form an eclectic mix with no obvious unifying theme, the street exhibits a degree of visual cohesion through some shared characteristics. There is a general consistency of the building line, which is set back from the road behind front gardens and driveways. The plot widths are also generally consistent, allowing space between the detached dwellings so as to not feel cramped. The majority of properties on the street are wider than they are tall, providing a horizontal emphasis.
4. In contrast to the prevailing pattern of development, the appeal site comprises a modest bungalow that makes little visual impact within King Edward Avenue. Its inconspicuous presence is largely due to its position set further back within the plot compared to neighbouring properties, which reduces its visibility from the street. In addition, although the building has retained a horizontal emphasis, the building is of a noticeable smaller scale and massing than most surrounding dwellings.
5. The proposal would increase the height of the dwelling, and would bring the front elevation closer to the front of the plot. Although the height of the 2 storey structure would be similar to other neighbouring dwellings, given the comparative width of the proposal, the resulting structure would appear as a tall narrow building within

the street scene. While I acknowledge that the first floor is set back from the front elevation, the verticality of the proposal would be at odds with the other dwellings with a horizontal emphasis on King Edward Avenue. In addition, the siting of the new dwelling further forward in the plot would give it more prominence within the street scene. As such, the tall narrow structure would be a prominent addition that would erode the character and appearance of the area.

6. Although the plot of No 15 is narrow, the existing bungalow responds to the overall pattern of development in terms of the gaps between it, and Nos 15 and 19. The proposal would be sited closer to the boundary with No 15 than the existing bungalow, significantly reducing the space between the buildings. The reduced gap would make the proposal feel cramped, as if it had been squeezed onto the plot. Although other dwellings on the road may have been built near to the boundary, particularly given the verticality and prominence of the proposed dwelling, the siting of it near to the boundary would not be in keeping with the overall pattern of development.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Policy 26 of the London Borough of Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (2021) (Local Plan), and Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, which seek to ensure development responds to distinctive local building forms and patterns of development by respecting the scale, massing and height of the surrounding physical context.

Living conditions

8. The rear elevation of the existing bungalow projects further than the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwellings. The ground floor of the proposed dwelling would project to the same distance as the existing bungalow, albeit, it would appear to be wider. The additional width would bring the side elevation of the proposal closer to the boundary of No 15. The reduction in the distance between the proposal and the boundary could give rise to a sense of enclosure experienced by the occupants of No 15. However, the building adjacent to the appeal site is used as a garage, and the garden of No 15 is wide. Given these factors in combination, the proposal being sited closer to the boundary would have limited negative impact on the outlook of the neighbouring occupiers of No 15.
9. The first floor element of the proposal would be set back from the rear of the ground floor. However, it would project beyond the rear elevation of both No 15 and No 19. Given the openness to the rear of No 15, the introduction of a small projection near to the boundary would not significantly harm the outlook of the occupants of No 15.
10. I note that the Council has concluded that the proposal would have an increased sense of enclosure and overbearing impact on the occupants of No 19. Given that the proposed ground floor element would not project any further, or be any closer to the boundary with No 19 than the existing bungalow, I do not find that the relationship between the projecting ground floor of the proposal would be different to the current situation. The proposal would be set away from the boundary between it and No 19, with the projection beyond the rear elevation being approximately similar to the distance between the dwellings. As such, the projection beyond the rear elevation of No 19 would have a negligible impact upon the outlook for the occupants of No 19.

11. I acknowledge the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2011), which identifies that extensions should not project more than 4m. However, the proposal would have the same projection beyond the rear elevations of the neighbouring dwellings as the existing bungalow. In addition, the proposal is not for an extension, therefore I give the SPD limited weight in my decision.
12. Accordingly, the proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would comply with Policy 7 of the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure that the living conditions of existing and future residents are protected, including outlook.

Other Matters

13. I am aware that the scheme before me was revised as a result of a previous refusal, the details of which have been provided to me by the appellant and Council. Nevertheless, the previous scheme bears limited weight on my decision, and I have determined the appeal before me on its own merits, for the reasons above.
14. Although the proposal would upgrade the building and increase its capacity, these benefits are of limited weight. As such, they would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance I have found above.

Conclusion

15. Although I have not found harm in respect to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers, given the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole. Therefore, taking into account all other considerations, for the reasons given the appeal should be dismissed.

R. Dickson

INSPECTOR