

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2017

by H Lock BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 09 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3176570
149 Goodmayes Lane, Ilford, IG3 9PW

- 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 W Butt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref. 1339/17, dated 23 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side extension at 149 Goodmayes Lane, Ilford, IG3 9PW, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 1339/17, dated 23 March 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan; drawing nos. 4899/3 and 4899/10.
 - 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 building.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council's officer report refers to the development as retrospective, and indicates that the extension for which planning permission was granted under application ref. 4415/16 was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans. However, it would appear that the development shown on the plans which accompany this appeal do not correspond with the extension built on site. Whilst there are some differences in fenestration, the key difference is that the roof ridge line and pitch of the side extension has been built closer to the ridge and pitch of the main house than indicated on the plan. Whilst I have had regard to the development as built, for the avoidance of doubt I have determined this appeal on the basis of the proposed development shown on the submitted plans.
-

3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. In Part E of the appeal form a different wording has been entered, but 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

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located on Goodmayes Lane, a road which changes in character and appearance at different points along its length. The appeal property is located in a stretch of the road which is characterised by dwellings from the same period and architectural style, primarily in a mix of terraced and semi-detached houses. The character is that of close-knit housing, and where gaps between buildings exist they are generally modest. Hipped roofs are a notable original feature in the street scene.
6. However, whilst the use of hipped roofs may have been part of the original architecture for the area, the street scene and roofscape is now interspersed with gable ends to properties, to an extent that this has become a commonplace feature on semi-detached and end-terrace houses.
7. The appeal property is positioned at the end of a terrace, and there is a modest pedestrian width gap between this and the adjacent end-terrace house, No.151. The main parties have not provided information regarding any planning permission granted for No.151, but it has a gable end that matches in roof design the side extension built at the appeal site, as opposed to that shown on the submitted plans. Whilst I accept that the construction of a gable end at the appeal site has resulted in some loss of visual separation at roof level, given the roof design at No.151 this spacing has already been compromised. Planning permission has been granted for a two-storey side extension at the appeal property, with a consequent closing of the spacing between Nos. 149 and 151; to create a hipped roof extension next to the gable end of No. 151 would not materially increase the visual separation between the two properties, but would instead draw attention to the difference in roof forms.
8. In this context, the proposal would not detract from the dwelling itself and would not be a visually intrusive, unduly dominant or detrimental feature in the street scene. Indeed, the extension as built demonstrates that a gable end provides cohesion between this and the neighbouring property.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would accord with the aims of Policy BD5 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 (DPD), in that it would complement the character of the building, and the roof profile and materials would be sympathetic to the existing dwelling; and with the overarching design expectations of DPD Policy BD1 and Strategic Policy 3 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit, I have attached a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. It is also appropriate to control materials to match the existing dwelling, in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the development and the area.

Conclusion

11. The National Planning Policy Framework establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and part of its environmental strand is to contribute to protecting and enhancing the built environment. A core planning principle of the Framework is to always seek to secure high quality design, and for the reasons given above the proposal would comply with this principle and would be sustainable development supported through the Framework. As a consequence, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR