
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2024 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MRTPI MIEMA CEnv

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/24/3339987

56 Parkway, Romford, Havering RM2 5PA

- 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 T Malik against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Havering.
 - The application Ref is P1565.23
 - The development proposed is roof alterations with the construction of a rear dormer window and insertion of roof windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for roof alterations with the construction of a rear dormer window and insertion of roof windows at 56 Parkway, Romford, Havering RM2 5PA in accordance with the terms of application Ref P1565.23 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing references 1958/01 and 1958/02 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Prior to the installation of the rooflights hereby permitted, details thereof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. They shall be fitted with obscure glass and permanently fixed shut and thereafter maintained as such. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

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 and Main Issue

3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was published between the determination of the application and this appeal (December 2023). The substantive content thereof as it relates to the main issue have not however changed. I am therefore satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by me taking the most up to date version of the Framework into account. I have proceeded on this basis.
4. The Council does not object to the insertion of a dormer window of the type, design and size proposed. I have no reason to disagree. Their reasons for refusal focus on the extended roof element and the insertion of rooflights. I have therefore approached my recommendation accordingly. The main issue is therefore whether the roof extension and rooflights would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Gidea Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The significance of the CA is derived, in part, from large individually designed detached dwelling houses set within spacious and generous plots with mature planting in the gardens, on the streets and open spaces. Houses are in a variety of designs and roof forms but reflect architectural features synonymous with the arts and crafts movement, dating from the early 20th Century. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling, one which was constructed as part of the 1911 House and Cottage Exhibition. It has an existing substantial two-storey rear extension which features two pitched roofs running at right angles to the main front section. The building's form, architectural detailing and designer contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CA in the visual and historical sense.
6. In using the roof space for additional accommodation, the two rearward projecting sections would be joined and the space between them filled in. The new single span roof would join atop with a flat section. Be this as it may, the flat roof section would be set down from and thus subservient to the main original roof section. It would follow its profile. The section would not be visible from the front and be barely perceptible from ground level. The extent of the works would be limited in the grand scheme of the building itself and would be associated with later additions, leaving the original roofscape on all but one elevation to remain appreciable.
7. Apart from the insertion of the roof-lights, the side elevations of the roof on the existing and original sections of the house would be largely unchanged. The rooflights are proposed to be of the flush conservation type which would assist in retaining the integrity of the roofscape. There is no specific policy or guidance before me to suggest that such sensitive additions should be avoided and the final appearance, type and finish of them can be conditioned. There are a number of similar examples locally.
8. Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would ensure that the character and appearance of the CA would be preserved. It would thus comply with the Framework and Policies 26 and 28 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 (2021). These, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development proposals are well designed and high quality which preserves, enhances or better reveals the character and appearance of a Conservation Area.

Other Matter

9. The dormer window would offer views of neighbouring gardens but due to its siting, these would be mainly of the lower ends and not the space to their immediate rears. Further, there are first floor rear windows already which offer very similar views. With these matters in mind, the privacy of neighbours would not be adversely affected.

Conditions

10. The time condition and one requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans are necessary for clarity and enforcement purposes. Given the architectural and historical significance of the existing building, a condition requiring matching materials for the extension works is justified. Given the scope of the works approved, I do not feel the submission of samples is reasonable. The rooflights need to be pre agreed in the interests of the architectural integrity of the roofscape. It would be sufficient to do this prior to their installation. I have also set out that, for the protection of the privacy of neighbours, they be obscure glazed and fixed shut.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend it be allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

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 allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the stated conditions.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR