

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2017

by M Seaton BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3165804

9 & 11 Roll Gardens, Gants Hill, Ilford, IG2 6TN

- 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 Mrs Shaheen El Mansouri against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1651/16, dated 14 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a double storey front extension.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The original planning application was made in the name of *Mr D El Mansouri*, but the appeal has been made by *Mrs Shaheen El Mansouri*. However, I have had regard to correspondence received from the applicant authorising the appeal to be progressed in his spouse's name. I have therefore identified the appellant accordingly.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal properties and on the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal properties are adjoining two-storey semi-detached dwellings set within a largely residential area. The existing dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site exhibit a degree of design variation. However, even within this context the pair of semi-detached dwellings the subject of the appeal are unusual in their design and character, incorporating as they do two-storey projections which extend closer to the street than the remainder of the dwellings, which are themselves positioned parallel to the street. Only Nos. 17 & 19 Roll Gardens were observed in close proximity to the appeal site to be of a similar design.
 5. The proposed extensions would infill the void at the front of the properties between the existing two-storey projections, utilising a design approach to mimic the design and appearance of the two-storey elements. In this respect, the proposed extensions would match the scale and disposition of the existing roof form, and would utilise matching materials for all external surfaces.
-

However, the front plane of the extensions would be set slightly back from the plane of the existing projections.

6. I am mindful that the appeal properties are set-back to a greater degree from the road than neighbouring properties, and that the extensions would also include the aforementioned further set-back. Furthermore, the proposed extensions would use matching materials which I accept would assist with the assimilation of the extensions with the host properties. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that despite this mitigation and the clear variety of dwelling design within the street, the proposed extensions would amount to a substantial and prominent form of development at the front of the two properties. The proposed roof form would appear as an awkward and visually incongruous repetition of the existing form, which ultimately would not appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling, and would be uncharacteristic within the street scene, as well as unacceptably eroding the existing character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings.
7. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development would result in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the appeal properties and on the area. As such there would be conflict with Strategic Policy 3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 (the Core Strategy), and Policies BD1 & BD5 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 (the Primary Policies DPD), and the London Borough of Redbridge Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (the Householder SPD). These policies seek to advocate high quality design, and require development to be compatible with the character of an area, be of a style, massing, scale and design appropriate to the locality and in the case of extensions to complement the character of the host building.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has highlighted that the proposed extensions would not result in any significant loss of amenity space of the properties, with particular reference made to Policy BD4(b) of the Primary Policies DPD. However, I note that the impact on existing levels of amenity space has not specifically been raised by the Council as an issue, and I am satisfied that there would not be an adverse impact in this respect as a consequence of the proposals.
9. I have also noted the appellant's reference to an earlier decision in 2011 made by the Council to allow extensions to an adjoining property, No. 13 Roll Gardens, with it contended that this decision has resulted in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the street, which contradicts the approach taken to the appeal proposals. However, I am satisfied that the nature of the appeal proposals is significantly different to the nature of any adjoining proposals, and irrespective of the Council's approach to the decision-making on the earlier planning permission, I have identified harm to the character and appearance of the appeal properties and area in this instance.
10. I have also had regard to the appellant's indication of a willingness to have considered amendments to the proposals in order to address the Council's concerns, but that the possibility of such amendments was not considered by the Council. Nevertheless, the Council were entitled to determine the planning application as originally applied for, and this procedural matter has not had any bearing on my determination of the planning merits of the appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

M Seaton

INSPECTOR