
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th February 2026

Appeal Ref: 6000910

Land adjacent to 1 Hood Walk, Romford, Essex RM7 8NU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Shahid Siddique Malik against the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P0822.25.
 - The development is described as “the proposal is for a two-storey, 2-bedroom end-of-terrace dwelling”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, and planning permission is refused.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters & Main Issue

3. The description on the application form differs to the decision notice. However, I am satisfied that the original description accurately describes the appeal development and is therefore reflected above. In addition, The Council issued a refusal notice after the appeal was made valid. Whilst this has identified the main issue, which is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the area, I have considered the appeal as one against non-determination.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is an open parcel of land directly adjacent a set of terraced dwellings, at the junction of Hood Walk and Lynton Avenue. Whilst differing in their degree, surrounding buildings are set back from the road with some parking to the front, presenting strong building lines to the street scene. The area is further characterised by multiple open undeveloped corners with wide pavements, modest boundary treatments and unoccupied land. These contribute to a pleasant consistent open feel to the surrounding streets which is a positive aspect of the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appeal proposal would sit in line with the existing terraced dwellings on Hood Walk in terms of height and siting. It would however project much further forward than the prevailing building line on Lynton Avenue. Which resultantly would erode its strength. The retaining side gap on the proposal towards Lynton Avenue would

be very small and whilst it may satisfy the Havering Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), it would not be sufficient to retain the quality in the area's consistency in terms of wider open corners. Currently, part of the appeal site is fenced off, however this doesn't diminish the importance that it serves as an open space and a buffer between the terraced buildings and the highway.

6. The proposal would be very narrow when viewed from Hood Walk and the overall design of the proposal has been suited to fit the constrained site rather than to sit comfortably with the rest of the terraced row. The design of the two-storey rear projection would be used to counteract the narrowness of the building and provide the appropriate amount of internal living space. However, it would appear contrived to fit a space and, given the prevailing consistent terraced setback, be visually intrusive. Moreover, its height and position would exacerbate its close proximity to Lynton Avenue, be imposing to users of the area and give the feel of closing off the open space, harming the street scene and its planned open character.
7. With this and the above in mind, the appeal scheme would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies 7 and 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2021 and paragraph 135 (d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Planning Balance, Conclusion and Recommendation

8. The Council is unable to demonstrate the supply of housing sites as required by the Framework and thus the most important policies are out of date. The appellant has not argued to the contrary and in the absence of anything otherwise, I would be taken to the relevant circumstances of paragraph 11. The scheme would be situated in a sustainable location in terms of a residential development. However as per the assessment above, it would not make effective use of the land and would not result in a contribution to a well-designed place nor provide affordable housing.
9. The appeal scheme would give rise to the harm I have described above. This would be long lasting and thus I afford it substantial weight. The proposal would provide housing but as a single unit the difference it would make to supply would be limited. The appellant has not provided any additional benefits of the scheme. There would be some economic effects during the construction phase and those of a social nature once the dwelling is occupied. These would again however be limited by time and the provision of one unit. I therefore attach limited weight to the benefits of the proposals. I have had regard to the key policies of the Framework set out but, in light of the harm I have found and the particular circumstances of the case, these do not materially affect my findings under paragraph 11.
10. As such, it is sufficiently clear that the adverse impacts of granting a planning permission for the appeal scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination. Consequently, the presumption in favour of sustainable development would not apply.
11. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan, and I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into

account other material considerations advanced and the approach of the Framework, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed, and planning permission is refused.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR