



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2020

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3254881

26 Ferndale Road, Romford RM5 3ER

- 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 Mr and Mrs Sadeque against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0391.20, dated 16 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as first floor side extension; conversion of garage to habitable accommodation; relocation of front entrance with front canopy; loft conversion with side dormer and 2no. rooflights to front and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side extension; conversion of garage to habitable accommodation; relocation of front entrance with front canopy; loft conversion with side dormer and 2no. rooflights to front and single storey rear extension at 26 Ferndale Road, Romford RM5 3ER in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0391.20, dated 16 March 2020 and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the site visit it appeared that the proposed development was substantially complete and that the application was submitted retrospectively. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
3. In light of the council's refusal reason, which solely related to the roof alteration, I have focussed my decision on that aspect of the development.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof alterations on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Ferndale Road is a quiet suburban cul-de-sac of predominantly terraced and two storey, semi-detached houses which are set behind front gardens with relatively long rear gardens. The appeal site is one of few detached houses in the street.

6. The roof designs within the street are generally hipped and from the front of No 26 this design is still evident despite the development being substantially complete. The rear roof alterations are required in order to accommodate a fifth bedroom.
7. At the site visit, and in particular from the rear garden of No 26, it was clear that many neighbouring properties have already been subject to loft conversions within Ferndale Road and neighbouring streets, as well as some dwellings having had rear and side extensions. These were evident from the presence of rooflights (on rear and front elevations) as well as some large box dormers particularly to rear elevations.
8. The loft conversion of No 26 is evident from the front of the house through the presence of rooflights on the front roof slope, with only a glimpsed view of the rear roof alterations. I therefore consider that the characteristic hipped roof form would remain as a dominant feature when viewed from the cul de sac.
9. The rear and side extensions and roof alterations as a whole are clearly substantial and to some may be seen as somewhat harmful. The roof alterations would also be visible from the rear gardens of a number of neighbouring properties. However, I consider they positively contribute to the overall appearance of the rear elevation, with the roof alterations adding a degree of symmetry.
10. I therefore do not consider the roof alterations to be sufficiently harmful to warrant a refusal and I consider that the characteristic hipped roof form would remain the dominant feature from the front elevation.
11. Overall and when viewed as part of the whole development, I do not consider the roof alterations conflict with the objectives of policy DC61 (Urban Design) of the London Borough of Havering Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2008), which seeks development that maintains, enhances or improves the character and appearance of the local area.
12. For the same reasons, I do not find conflict with policies 7.4 (Local Character) and 7.6 (Architecture) of the London Plan (2016) which both seek development that contributes to local character and appearance.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR