



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2017

by A J Mageean BA (Hons) BPI PhD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/17/3180102

37 Osborne Road, Forest Gate, London E7 0PJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Zahida Perveen Syeed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 17/01605/HH, dated 9 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is retrospective planning application for the retention of roof tiles over 37 Osborne Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Woodgrange Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a double fronted villa within a street of similarly designed period detached and terraced, properties located within the Woodgrange Estate Conservation Area (CA). These dwellings are mostly brick built with Welsh slate roofs and design elements typical of late Victorian housing, as well as more unusual features such as glazed canopies to front elevations. These houses have to a large degree retained their traditional and consistent appearances. Osborne Road and adjacent streets, which are laid out in a largely uniform grid pattern, are also characterised by their relatively quiet, spacious and leafy qualities. Overall the architectural uniformity and regular layout support the cohesive character of this area.
4. The appeal proposal is the retention of the current roof covering of red clay tiles. This material contrasts with the dark grey appearance and slim, precise profile of traditional the Welsh slate tiles. As the appeal property is a significantly sized and centrally placed property within the street, the discordant appearance of its roof in terms of both its bright colour and the thicker, ridged appearance of the tiles, stands out as a jarring element within what is otherwise a simple and modest roofscape. Whilst I accept that dark grey clay tiles have been introduced to other properties on Osborne Road, these appear as more subtle alterations as they are more closely aligned in colour at least to the traditional Welsh slate which predominate in this area.

5. The appellant states that this alteration does not harm the outlook of residential properties, and notes that this property retains other traditional architectural features. Whilst I agree that there is no harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of properties within this area, the concern is the effect of this very visible roof alteration on the traditional appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. In this respect the *Woodgrange Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Proposals* state that roofs are one of the most visible and prominent features of period houses. It also identifies those alterations to properties which pose a threat to the special character of the area as including *alterations and additions to the roofscape and form*. In this context it is clear that the appeal scheme would not preserve the character or appearance of this area.
6. Certain minor works, including replacement roofing materials, can take place to unlisted buildings in conservation areas without requiring planning permission. However, the damage which can be caused by alterations of this nature has led to the CA being the subject of a comprehensive Article 4 direction. This special regulation brings a range of minor alterations under planning control. This is in addition to the statutory duty in section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which is a matter of considerable importance and weight. In this case whilst the harm caused by this roofing material is significant, it is less than the substantial harm referred to by the National Planning Policy Framework. However, there are no public benefits that outweigh the harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset.
7. I therefore conclude that this proposal does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Woodgrange Estate Conservation Area. It conflicts with the London Plan Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8, the London Borough of Newham Local Plan: Core Strategy (Core Strategy) 2012 Policies S6, SP1, SP3 and SP5, the London Borough of Newham Local Plan: Detailed Sites and Policies Development Plan 2016 Policy SP8 and the Woodgrange Estate Conservation Area Design Guide which, taken together, require development to recognise local character and distinctiveness and to conserve and enhance heritage assets. Policy 7.5 of the London Plan and Policy SP2 of the Core Strategy are also referred to but are not relevant in this case.
8. For these reasons, taking into consideration all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

AJ Mageean

INSPECTOR