

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by David Hogger BA MSc MRTPI MCIHT

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

Decision date: 13 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3156741

44-46 Clarendon Gardens, Ilford, Redbridge IG1 3JW

- 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 Ghir and Mr Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2129/16, dated 6 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as a loft conversion with rear dormer and hip to gable alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with rear dormer and hip to gable alterations at 44-46 Clarendon Gardens, Ilford, Redbridge IG1 3JW in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2129/16 dated 6 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SSC 84/1, 2 and 3, and SSC 83/LOC.
 - (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 dwellings.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal includes the extension of the two dwellings (i.e. number 44 and number 46) in a similar manner. To one side of the appeal properties is a terrace of three dwellings (numbers 38 – 42) and to the other side is a terrace of four dwellings (numbers 48 – 54). There are many differences in terms of the appearance and design of the dwellings in Clarendon Gardens but one of the main architectural features that, in terms of appearance, helps to unify the street are the two-storey protruding gabled bays, many of which I would describe as comparatively ornate.

4. However, there are other architectural features that also contribute to the character of Clarendon Gardens (for example the front balconies) and it is a combination of all these features that provide the architectural interest. I agree with the Council that the roof-scape does contribute in a positive way to the appearance of the area but I would not describe this element of design as the over-riding characteristic of the street. Whilst a majority of roofs in the road are hipped, the immediately adjacent property at No 48 has a gable. The fact that there are a number of terraces in the street and also that the gap between detached properties is comparatively narrow, mean that the visual significance of the side walls to dwellings is comparatively small.
5. The proposed development would include the retention of the featured bays to the front and the fact that it is proposed to undertake similar alterations to the roofs of both the semi-detached dwellings (i.e. numbers 44 and 46) means that in this part of the street a level of uniformity in terms of roof form would be achieved and there would be a significant degree of symmetry between the two dwellings. The ridgelines of the two side extensions would remain lower than the central ridge, thus maintaining a level of sub-ordination in terms of appearance.
6. The proposed development would result in the 'loss' of the two storey flat roof side extension at No 46 which I consider contributes little to the character of the area. Although this is not a matter on which my decision turns, it adds weight to my overall conclusion.
7. I have given careful consideration as to whether or not the grant of planning permission would set a precedent for other similar proposals nearby. However, each appeal must be determined on its own merits and bearing in mind the particular characteristics of this proposal there is no reason to suppose that my decision would set an undesirable precedent.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework emphasises the need for good design but in a sustainable location such as this it is also important that the potential of a site to accommodate development is optimised. Policy SP3 of the Redbridge Core Strategy requires new buildings to achieve a high standard of design. Policies BD1 and BD5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies DPD require development to be compatible with and contribute to the character of the area and, in terms of extensions, to complement the character of the existing building. I am satisfied, for the reasons given above, that this proposal meets those requirements and that the character and appearance of the area would be retained.

Conditions

9. The Council suggests three conditions including the standard time condition. A condition requiring development to be undertaken in accordance with the submitted plans is necessary because this provides certainty and a condition regarding the use of appropriate materials is required in order to ensure that the appearance of the development would be appropriate and acceptable. I impose all three conditions.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

David Hogger

Inspector