

OFFICER REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY

APPLICATION NO: P2016.21

WARD : Pettits

Date Received: 19th October 2021

ADDRESS: 6 Risebridge Road
Romford

PROPOSAL: First floor rear extension and replacement original roof chimney with fibre glass chimney with original bricks slips

DRAWING NO(S): BR03 Rev A
BR01
BR02 Rev A

RECOMMENDATION : It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the reason(s) given at the end of the report

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two storey detached dwelling, located on Risebridge Road within the Gidea Park Conservation Area. The property is not listed.

No. 6 Risebridge Road was designed by architects Mauchlen & Weightman, who also designed a Class I Exhibition cottage on Reed Pond Walk. The exhibition book states the theme of the property was 'to obtain a cottage in appearance both restful and interesting. This effect has largely been gained by the simple unbroken roof and quiet gables'. The site makes a positive contribution to the special interest of the CA by its architectural quality and the demonstrable historic interest through the influence of the original Exhibition Houses as show homes for further development within the estate.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Consent is sought for the formation of a first floor rear extension over an existing single storey rear extension. In addition reference is made to replacing original roof chimney with fibre glass chimney with original bricks slips. There is some ambiguity over this element however it is assumed that the intent is to match closely in so far as is possible the original chimney stack.

In 2018 consent was refused for a first floor rear extension for the following reason under reference P0012.18. This decision has relevance to the current proposals. Reason for refusal:

The proposed development would, by reason of its design, height, bulk, mass, appear as an unacceptably dominant and visually intrusive feature in the streetscene harmful to the appearance of the surrounding area and the character of the application premises when viewed as a heritage asset failing to preserve or enhance the special character of this part of the Conservation Area contrary to Policies DC68 and DC61 of the LDF Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

In the intervening period the Council has adopted the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 which replaces the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD.

RELEVANT HISTORY

P0012.18 - First-floor part rear extension and provision of conservation type rooflight to roof.
Refuse 12-03-2018

P0993.14 - Proposed loft conversion with conservation style rooflights.

Apprv with cons 10-02-2015

P0992.14 - Single storey rear extension

Apprv with cons 10-02-2015

CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbouring properties were consulted through direct notification, in addition to this a site notice was displayed adjacent to the site and the application was advertised in the local press. Two letters of objection were received from residents with the comments made as follows:

- Loss of privacy/overlooking
- Harmful precedent
- Out of character/detrimental to Conservation Area and subject property

In addition the following comments have been made by other stakeholders:

Gidea Park Civic Society - Objection

Council Heritage Advisor - Objection

RELEVANT POLICIES

MAYORAL CIL IMPLICATIONS

Owing to the limited floor area created the proposals are not liable for a contribution under CIL regulations.

STAFF COMMENTS

The main issues in this case are the impact of the proposal on the streetscene including the Gidea Park Conservation Area, the impact on neighbouring amenity and any highway and parking issues.

DESIGN/IMPACT ON STREET/GARDEN SCENE

The application site is located within the Gidea Park Conservation Area which is characterised by individually designed early 20th century houses influenced by the arts and crafts movement. The Conservation Area contains housing and shops built around a road layout dating from 1910 based on the garden suburb principles and featuring two areas of architectural exhibition and competition housing. The character of the residential parts of the Conservation Area is one of individually designed dwellings in mature gardens. Nearly all of the houses are detached and the roads are spacious and generous; the variety of designs and the mature planting in streets, gardens and open spaces contributes to a residential environment of high quality and unique character. The mature gardens, trees and boundary hedges form an integral part of the character of the Gidea Park Conservation Area.

The statutory duty applied to Local Planning Authorities in the exercise of their planning functions in conservation areas is set out in section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This is that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. This is reflected in Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 Policy 28 which states that the Council will support proposals that, amongst other things, would provide well designed and high quality development in a Conservation Area.

6 Risebridge Road is situated within the Gidea Park Conservation Area (the CA) and was one of

the Class II houses (catalogue number 294) constructed as part of the 1910/11 Gidea Park Exhibition. This Exhibition aimed to demonstrate "the improvement in modern housing and building, due to the advance of Scientific Knowledge, the Revival of Arts and Craft, and the Progress of the Garden Suburb movement" and in doing so "assist in raising the standard of housing, not only in the Outer Metropolis of London, but throughout Great Britain".

Turning to the first floor rear extension the application property is a 1911 Exhibition House that benefits from a contemporary ground floor extension that has a lightweight and modern appearance. Such additions have been supported previously as an alternative to extensions that imitate original features as they are capable of being read independently of the form of the original building. Given the proportions of the ground floor extension, in so far as that it spans the width of the building at ground level the first floor remains the sole unaltered element of the rear elevation.

The proposal would partially extrude the principal roof to the rear to result in a discernibly incongruous form, undermining the architectural interest of an authentic property of the Exhibition estate. In this regard, it is important to note that both gables and the unbroken roofscape are significant to the architectural interest of the property. Whilst it could be reasoned that the addition would exhibit some degree of subservience, more so than the earlier submission under P0012.18, the Council's heritage advisor states that it would be incompatible with the subject dwelling noting that the generous gap between the site and the adjoining property would mean the extension would be highly visible from the street and neighbouring properties. Accordingly the view is that the development would not only harm the architectural interest of the site by affecting the unbroken roofscape but would also adversely affect the character and appearance of the CA.

Whilst the proposal is to the rear of the property there is, nevertheless, a high level of inter-visibility and consequently the proposal would be visible from surrounding properties. The proposal would, therefore, have a harmful affect on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The individual Exhibition Houses make a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA and owing to their historic, architectural and archaeological interests, is considered to be Non-designated Heritage Asset (NDHA). The Council's Heritage Advisor has objected on the impacts of the development on the architectural interest of the subject property and the high visibility of the proposed extension.

With regards to the replacement of the existing chimney stack with a fibreglass alternative with matching brick-slips, this would be detrimental to the architectural integrity of the subject property. No justification has been provided in the form of a heritage statement setting out this aspect in any sufficient level of detail or the rationale for it. The drawings are suggestive of a like-for-like replacement, however within the current submission there is insufficient information to conclude on this, nor is there sufficient information to conclude whether its replacement would be sufficiently justified.

Therefore, paying special attention to the desirability of preserving the character and appearance of the CA, as required under Section 72(1) of Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 there would be conflict. Whilst amounting to less than substantial harm to the significance of the Gidea Park Conservation Area, making Paragraph 202 of the NPPF relevant. Whilst there would be benefits for the applicant, with regards to increased and improved living space, this would not outweigh the harm identified. At its core the fundamental requirement of Policy 28 of the HLP is for officers to determine whether development would preserve or enhance the character of the area in line with the NPPF.

IMPACT ON AMENITY

Whilst comments by residents are noted, it is not considered that the extension would not be unneighbourly. The views achieved from first floor windows within the extension, whilst brought deeper into the site would not be out of character in this context or sufficiently harmful to withhold permission. With regards to the presence of the addition at first floor in terms of outlook and loss of light and overshadowing, there would be adequate separation from shared boundaries to mitigate any impacts.

HIGHWAY/PARKING

The proposal would not give rise to any highway/parking issues.

KEY ISSUES/CONCLUSIONS

6 Risebridge Road has demonstrable historic interest through the influence of the original Exhibition Houses as show homes for further development within the estate and as one of the original Class II homes.

Accordingly having regard to the above and in doing so all relevant planning policy refusal is recommended accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that **planning permission be REFUSED** for the following reason(s):

1. Refusal reason non standard 1

The provision of a first floor rear extension to an original Exhibition House would be detrimental to the architectural interest of the subject property through affecting the unbroken roofscape and would through its visibility adversely affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such the development would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Gidea Park Conservation Area. The development would conflict with policies 26 and 28 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 and the objectives of the NPPF. The development also fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Gidea Park Conservation Area, therefore contrary to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

2. Refusal reason non standard 2

Insufficient information has been provided to judge whether the removal of the chimney stack and replacement with fibreglass alternative would affect the architectural integrity and interest of the subject dwelling which, as an Exhibition House is a key consideration. As such and in the absence of evidence to the contrary the development would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the Gidea Park Conservation Area. The development would conflict with policies 26 and 28 of the Havering Local Plan 2016-2031 and the objectives of the NPPF. The development also fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Gidea Park Conservation Area, therefore contrary to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

1 Refusal - No negotiation

Statement Required by Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015: Consideration was given to seeking amendments, but given conflict with adopted planning policy, notification of intended refusal and the reason(s) for it was given to the agent in writing 20-01-2022

Authorising Officer:	Simon Thelwell	<i>Simon Thelwell</i>	21-01-2022
Authorising Officer:	Simon Thelwell		21-01-2022