



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

by K E Down MA (Oxon) MSc MRTPI MRSB

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

Decision date: 3 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3164475

9 Tillotson Road, Ilford, IG1 4UZ

- 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 Mohammed Razaq against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2195/15, dated 29 May 2015, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is to demolish existing single storey extension and garage. Build new two storey side extension and part single storey part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to demolish existing single storey extension and garage. Build new two storey side extension and part single storey part two storey rear extension at 9 Tillotson Road, Ilford, IG1 4UZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2195/15, dated 29 May 2015, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) 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.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan, Dwg Nos 1423/10, 1423-01, 1423/02, 1423/3, 1519/01, 1519/02, 1519/03.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed roof of the two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene of Tillotson Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a large, semi-detached dwelling of traditional, inter-war design set on a large plot. It lies within a mature and spacious suburban street comprising similar dwellings, together with more recent additions and older dwellings of a different, more compact style. Roofs are a mixture of hips and gables with neither style being noticeably more characteristic of the street
-

scene than the other. No 11, the attached pair, is a similarly imposing property to the appeal dwelling. It has a two storey side extension with a hipped roof that ties into the ridge of the original main roof. No 7 has a more cottagey style with lower eaves and ridge and smaller windows. No 7 extends at first floor to the shared boundary with No 9 and has a hipped roof running up and away from that boundary.

4. The appeal dwelling has been extended in the past through a hip to gable roof conversion, coupled with a box dormer extension to the rear. An approved first floor extension above the existing garage is currently under construction and will extend to the shared boundary. This was permitted under planning permission ref. 1999/14 dated 5 August 2014. The roof of the approved extension slopes up from the shared boundary to a point on the gable end below the main ridge. It is thus not a true hip and would have a somewhat discordant appearance. It appears to be an attempt to match the extended hipped roof at No 11, the semi-detached pair. However, owing to the constraints of the existing hip to gable alteration, it fails to achieve this. Nevertheless, some of the gap above first floor level between Nos 9 and 7 would be retained.
5. The appeal proposal is for a simple gable ended roof over the two storey side extension. This would be set down from the main ridge and back from the front elevation, ensuring it remained subservient to the host dwelling. The eaves height and roof pitch would match the existing dwelling. It would fill more of the gap above first floor than the approved roof but would integrate more readily with the existing gable end, resulting in a more aesthetically pleasing appearance.
6. Given the presence of other gable ended roofs in the street, meaning that the proposed roof would not be out of keeping with the street scene, the nub of the issue is whether the balance lies in favour of maximising the gap through the use of a dummy hip, as approved, or opting for a design that would fill more of the gap but be more sympathetic to the host dwelling.
7. Gaps between dwellings are characteristic in Tillotson Road but they are variable in width and on the opposite side of the street there is a terrace of four dwellings similar in design to the appeal property, where gaps are absent. There is thus no consistency. In consequence the reduction in the size of the gap between Nos 7 and 9 resulting from the proposed roof would not noticeably detract from the character of the street or appear unduly cramped.
8. As reasoned above the approved roof would not match the roof at No 11 and I am therefore satisfied that the proposed gable end would not unbalance the semi-detached pair to a materially greater extent than the approved scheme. Moreover, since the proposed roof would be subservient to and blend easily with the host dwelling it would not be an overly dominant or intrusive feature in the street scene.
9. It is therefore concluded on the main issue that the proposed roof of the two storey side extension would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host property or the street scene of Tillotson Road. In consequence there would be no conflict with Policy SP3 of the Core Strategy, 2008, Policies BD1 and BD5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies

Development Plan Document, 2008, or Policy 7.4 of the London Plan which, taken together, expect extensions to dwellings to be designed to a high standard such that they complement the character of the host building in terms of scale, style, form and materials and are compatible with and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the surrounding area in terms of, amongst other things, pattern and grain.

10. The Council suggests three conditions, including the statutory commencement condition. This condition is not necessary because the development for which planning permission is sought has already been commenced. I agree that a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In addition a condition requiring the extension to be built using external materials that match the host dwelling is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.
11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR