

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2016

by Timothy C King BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3153944

2 Stonehall Avenue, Cranbrook, Ilford, IG1 3SH

- 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 Robert Jenkins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1781/16, dated 10 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is '*Single storey rear and two storey side extension.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of an existing garage and the erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, single storey front extension and alterations to the front porch at 2 Stonewall Avenue, Cranbrook, Ilford, IG1 3SH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 1781/16, dated 10 February 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PLA/01, PLA/02, PLA/03, PLA/04, PLA/05, PLA/06, PLA/07, PLA/08, PLA/09, PLA/010 and PLA/011.
 - ii) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the alterations hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Robert Jenkins against the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matters

3. At my site visit I noted that the two-storey side extension, the contentious element in this appeal, is already under construction, although it has yet to be roofed. I am, nonetheless, required to assess the scheme as a proposal for development. The part retrospective nature of the development has not affected my conclusions.
-

4. I have altered the proposal's description to focus more comprehensively on the development involved.
5. Given, presumably, that the site enjoys an extant permission to extend the dwelling, the Council has only raised objections to the proposed roof treatment over the two-storey side extension. I agree with this approach, and my assessment will be confined to the planning merits, or otherwise, of this element of the proposal.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in this appeal is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and its surrounding area.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse set within the locally designated Cathedral Estate Residential Precinct which typifies a residential style redolent of its time. The said dwelling is a case in point, built in the early to mid-twentieth century, and along with its immediate neighbour, No 4, and consistent with other pairs of houses in the vicinity, the original roof design had characteristic hip-ends. Although No 4 still displays this original roof form the appeal dwelling has recently undergone a development involving a dormer roof extension on the rear roofslope, facilitated by a hip to gable extension. This was undertaken by means of householder permitted development entitlement and has effectively superseded a previous planning permission granted in April 2016 for a two-storey side extension which showed an overlying hip-ended roof.
8. The approved extension would have reflected the main roof's form and the Council comments that the proposed arrangement would have also showed subordination to the host dwelling. It is widely established in general design guidance that this is an important factor when weighing up the appropriateness of residential extensions. However, in this particular instance, with the recent alterations subsequently undertaken, it would no longer be practicable to implement the extant planning permission.
9. Policies BD1 and BD5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) generally require that new development, and by way of the latter, residential extensions, should be well designed and, amongst other things, should have regard to local character. As the gable-ended roof form is uncharacteristic of such the proposal is inconsistent with these design based policies and I must disagree with the appellant's somewhat sweeping comment that the proposed two storey extension will be in complete accordance with these policies, and others, cited in the Council's reason for refusal. More particularly, the appellant would appear to have used the permitted development entitlement to predicate the development now at appeal, effectively superseding the previously approved scheme. The resultant roof design, overlying the two-storey side extension, is thereby now of primary importance.
10. Although not mentioned in the Council's decision notice the appellant has guided me to Redbridge's Supplementary Planning Document 'Householder Design Guide' (SPD) which advises that two-storey side extensions should

generally be set back a minimum of 0.5m from the main front wall and have a lower ridge line than the existing house, and be of matching design. Irrespective of the hip-ended roof existing at No 4, given the recently constructed gable end at the appeal dwelling, and in the interests of a satisfactory design solution, I consider that this has to now be the starting point when weighing up an appropriate roof form for the extension. The said two provisos are also met, although the proposed step-down from the main ridgeline is marginal.

11. Employing a hip-ended roof would no longer be the best approach as it would be visually incompatible with the alterations already made. In this connection I have also had particular regard to a similar development at No 16 Stonehall Avenue where the same issues would have likely arisen. The appeal dwelling also has the advantage of being the last property fronting Stonehall Avenue on its eastern side behind those on Wanstead Lane which, due to the space separation, would lessen the development's impact.
12. I find this appeal is a case where, although the proposal conflicts with the finer aims of the relevant planning policies, other material considerations to be taken into account when weighing up the issues, indicate differently. Accordingly, although I have given the relevant policies due consideration and whilst not lessening their primacy, in order to ensure a satisfactory visual appearance due to the circumstances involved, I consider that they should here be overridden.
13. I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character or appearance of either the host dwelling or its surrounding area and the more general aim of DPD Policies BD1, BD5 and E3 and Policy SP3 of the Council's Core Strategy to ensure a compatible design would, on balance, be met in this instance.
14. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal succeeds. As regards conditions, there is no need to impose the statutory time limitation requirement as works have already commenced. However, to ensure a satisfactory appearance I impose a condition requiring the use of matching materials. Also, in the interests of certainty I have imposed a condition necessitating that the development be implemented in accordance with the plans hereby approved.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR