



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June, 2017

by S. J. Buckingham, BA (Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI FSA

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

Decision date: 25th July, 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/17/3171350

29 Wallington Road, Seven Kings, Ilford, IG3 8QQ

- 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 Harman Bhangu – Delta Properties Ltd. against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref: 1834/16 dated 25 April, 2016 was refused by notice dated 12 December, 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as extension to existing flat conversion of 2 x 1 bed flat (2 person) to provide increased accommodation to 2 x 2 bed (3 person) flats; extensions are proposed to the rear of the ground floor, first floor level along with a loft conversion; the loft extension proposes a rear dormer, hip to gable extension and roof lights to the front elevation; the existing rear garden is proposed to be split into 2 No. private gardens, serving as amenity for each flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed, but nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Number 29 Wallington Road is one of a pair of modest, semi-detached, twentieth century houses. Wallington Road has a strongly consistent character of such paired houses sitting under a shared pitched and hipped roof. The appeal proposal includes the creation of a hip-to-gable roof extension and extension of the existing rear projection at first floor level.
 5. Although there are a small number of gabled extensions to previously hipped roofs in the area around the appeal site, the character of Wallington Road itself is very consistent, with the majority of hipped roofs retained. The proposed
-

roof extension would therefore stand out as harmfully uncharacteristic in the street scene due to its design and bulk, and would unbalance the symmetry of the semi-detached pair when viewed from the front, which would also cause harm.

6. Other streets close by are more mixed in character, and such extensions therefore appear less obtrusive in those locations than in the noticeably consistent street scene of Wallington Road. I note the suggestion of the appellant that such alterations could be made to dwellinghouses in the area under permitted development rights, but it is a matter of fact on the ground that few have been, fewer still in Wallington Road.
7. The rear elevations of houses along Wallington Road also exhibit a high degree of consistency, with a regular rhythm of paired outrigger extensions, and, notwithstanding the presence of conservatories and other extensions at ground floor levels, most of these paired rear projections remaining unaltered at first floor level.
8. The proposed first floor rear extension would project just under two metres beyond the existing rear building line, and although it would retain the same roof pitch, it would as a result sit noticeably beyond the rear building line of the adjoining extension, which it would formerly have matched. It would therefore stand out as odd and uncharacteristic in the context of the area.
9. Although alterations to the rear of the building would not be visible from the public realm, it appears to me that they would be seen from some other properties along the same road, and from the rear of houses along Mitcham Road to the west. Their harmful effect on the character of the area would therefore be evident.
10. I have had regard to the appeal decisions put before me by the appellant, and while I cannot disagree that the extent to which an alteration is visible from the public realm may affect how material the effect of the alteration is, it appears to me that in this case the alterations would be visible from a sufficient number of vantage points to have a materially harmful effect, particularly given the very consistent character of the rear of dwellings along Wallington Road.
11. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with policy BD1 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies 2008 (the BWPP) which seeks development which is compatible with and contributes to the distinctive character of the area in which it is located, and policy BD5 of the BWPP which seeks extensions which complement the character of the building. It would also conflict with policy SP3 of the Council's Core Strategy 2008 which requires new development to respect the character of the locality. It would also fail to accord with advice contained in the Householder Design Guide SPD in relation to changes to roof shapes.
12. While I acknowledge that the appeal proposal would have some benefits in the form of increasing floorspace to the flats, and through the provision of larger units, I do not consider that they would be sufficiently great to outweigh the harm I have identified. I conclude therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, that the appeal should be dismissed.

S J Buckingham INSPECTOR