



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2022

by E Dade BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/22/3304028

38 Tudor Avenue, Romford RM2 5NA

- 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 Pol Exeter against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref P0634.22, dated 17 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of existing double-glazed windows and doors with double glazed units - 5 windows to front elevation, 3 windows to right elevation, 3 windows to left elevation, 3 windows to rear elevation. Also 1 rear kitchen door and 1 double door with 2 side panels and 2 openable top windows. All are to be manufactured from the Logik casement range or similar in PVCu profiles, designed to replicate the existing windows and doors in style and colour. In addition, replacing of front 3 steps rectangular access with 4 steps circular access, constructed with bricks and concrete/paving slabs to match existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the replacement of existing double-glazed windows and doors with double glazed units - 5 windows to front elevation, 3 windows to right elevation, 3 windows to left elevation, 3 windows to rear elevation. Also 1 rear kitchen door and 1 double door with 2 side panels and 2 openable top windows. All are to be manufactured from the Logik casement range or similar in PVCu profiles, designed to replicate the existing windows and doors in style and colour. In addition, replacing of front 3 steps rectangular access with 4 steps circular access, constructed with bricks and concrete/paving slabs to match existing, at 38 Tudor Avenue, Romford RM2 5NA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P0634.22, dated 17 April 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: EXETER-TD-22-302-E1 (REV 1A), EXETER-TD-22-302-E2 (REV 1A), EXETER-TD-22-302-P1 (REV 1A), EXETER-TD-22-302-P2 (REV 1A), EXETER-TD-22-302-P3 (REV 1A).

Preliminary Matters

2. From my site visit I found the proposal had been partly implemented, as the replacement front steps were already constructed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the Gidea Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated at Tudor Avenue, a tree-lined, suburban, residential street, consisting mainly of semi-detached dwellings from the inter-war period which are generally uniform in design and appearance.
5. The appeal site is located within the Gidea Park Conservation Area (CA), close to the CA boundary. The Gidea Park Conservation Area Appraisal describes the CA's characteristics and historic significance. The CA comprises a large part of a residential suburb known as Gidea Park and includes roads initially laid out in 1910 on the Gidea Hall and Balgores Estates to the north and south of Main Road.
6. The CA appraisal describes the CA as a predominantly suburban residential area with a unique history and character, with distinct areas of different provenance and character. This includes areas designed by prominent architects of the period which were constructed as competition and exhibition areas in 1910/11 and 1933/34. The CA appraisal draws a clear distinction between areas north and south of Main Road, with the appeal site situated in this southern area. Compared with the area to the north of Main Road, the south area has a greater variety of periods and house types with more later speculative infill development of less unusual designs, and a greater presence of other uses such as commercial activities.
7. The appeal property is a detached house with a front gable, pitched clay tile roof and black, timber eaves. The exterior of the house is finished in white render with brick at the lower section. A storm porch constructed of black-painted timber with a tiled roof adjoins the front elevation and front projection. A bay window is located below the storm porch on the front elevation with the black, timber front door situated on the side of the front projection.
8. The appeal property's existing windows on the front and side elevations are of timber construction with black frames, white-painted casements and an artificial lead pattern. From my site visit, I was able to confirm that the existing timber-framed windows are double-glazed. At the rear elevation, the existing windows and doors are of white uPVC, double-glazed construction.
9. The appeal property is of a traditional style, similar in appearance to other dwellings along Tudor Avenue. However, there are a number of differences in terms of the appeal property's form, layout and design which suggest it is a more recent addition to Tudor Avenue. Notably, the appeal property's front projection is of a simple, geometric form which lacks the large bay window and column present on other period properties on the street. Ornate architectural features which are common at dwellings along Tudor Avenue, such as hood porches and brick detailing, are notably absent from the appeal property.
10. Whilst located within the CA, the appeal property is not an 'exhibition' house as described by the CA appraisal. However, the appeal property contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA through its form, design and style which complements the architectural character of other dwellings within the CA.
11. The proposal includes the installation of uPVC windows which replicate the existing windows in terms of placement, size, design, style, and colour. Due to the similarity in appearance between the existing and proposed windows, I do

not consider the proposal would diminish the dwelling's contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.

12. In addition, the proposal includes the replacement of the front steps. The new steps had been constructed at time of my site visit. The Council's delegated report indicates the Council considers the proposed steps to be acceptable and its refusal to grant planning permission relates to the proposed replacement windows only. The steps are of brick construction which complements the existing building. I consider the front steps do not adversely affect the character and appearance of the building or CA.
13. The extent of the change to the appearance of the dwelling would be minimal and would not amount to harm to the character and appearance of the building or the CA. Consequently, the proposal would not conflict with Policy 26 of the Havering Local Plan 2021 (HLP), which requires proposals to be of high-quality design which is informed by and respects and complements the distinctive qualities of the area.
14. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. In the absence of harm to the CA's character and appearance, I conclude that the proposal has a neutral effect upon the heritage asset's significance. The proposal therefore accords with HLP Policy 28 which supports proposals which do not affect the significance of heritage assets, London Plan 2021 Policy HC1 which requires proposal to be sympathetic to the significance of heritage assets, and para. 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework which gives great weight to the conservation of heritage assets.

Conditions

15. I have not attached the standard condition regarding the period for implementation since development has commenced through construction of the front steps. I have included a condition specifying the approved plans in the interests of providing certainty.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the development accords with the development plan taken as a whole and therefore I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

E Dade

INSPECTOR