



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2019

by J Slominski BA(Hons) MCD

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/19/3224068

602 Green Lane, ILFORD IG3 9SQ

- 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 K Sangha against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge ("the Council").
 - The application Ref 4280/18, dated 26 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is Proposed mansard roof extension and formation of 1 bedroom self contained flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposed development on:
 - i. Character and appearance; and
 - ii. Living Conditions for future residents.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a three storey property with a commercial unit at ground floor and residential accommodation above. It is located on the southern side of Green Lane, and due to its position opposite the junction it forms the termination of views looking south along Goodmayes Road.
4. The building is part of a relatively uniform row of similar buildings which have been altered over time with replacement windows and shopfronts, but retain their original brick front elevations, decorative window surrounds, pilasters, and parapets. The rear elevations are less intact with some being rendered and painted, and various flues, pipes and vents having been installed. Within its immediate context are buildings of varied heights, generally 2-4 storeys, including buildings with 3-4 storey brick elevations and additional set-back storeys on Green Lane to the east and north west of the site; and two storey brick buildings with flat or pitched roofs. A mix of building styles and heights therefore exists nearby. The row within which the appeal site is distinctive in its context for having an intact row of "butterfly" roofs which are visible from the rear, but hidden behind the parapet on the front elevation.

5. The proposed development would replace the existing butterfly roof with a traditional mansard roof with a dormer window on the front elevation, and two dormer windows on the rear elevation. The traditional design of the mansard roof with its sloped walls, sensitively proportioned dormers aligned with the windows below, and the use of brick firebreak walls would relate well to the design of the original property. The proposal would result in a four storey building which would not be unusual height within its wider setting. There are also buildings on Goodmayes Road which feature mansard roofs, and mansard roofs are not a wholly unusual feature within the surroundings.
6. However, the appeal site is not a standalone building and forms part of a uniform row of buildings with a uniform roofline. The proposal would not respect the silhouette or uniformity of the overall row and would instead result in a stepped roofline which bears no relation to the rest of the silhouette. When viewed as one composition the proposal would undermine the existing character of the row of buildings, the detriment of the existing architecture.
7. The proposal would result in the loss of the existing butterfly roof. The roof itself is only marginally visible in glimpse views from Broomhill Road and Goodmayes Lane, and the loss of the concrete roof tiles would be of little consequence. However the zig-zag profile of the rear elevation is more prominent, in part due to the building being one storey higher than those to the south (at the rear). The replacement of the prominent v-shaped profile of the rear elevation with a flat parapet would undermine the rhythm of the rear elevations of the row of buildings, and harm the appearance of the row.
8. Overall I therefore find that the proposal would undermine the existing uniformity of the roofline of the row of buildings, including the characterful and prominent v-shaped profile of the rear elevation, and it would result in a significant adverse effect on the visual amenities of the locality. It would therefore be contrary to London Plan 2016 Policies 7.4 and 7.6 and Redbridge Local Plan 2018 ("Local Plan") Policy LP26 which together require high quality design with proportion, composition and scale that contributes positively to coherent streetscapes.

Living Conditions for future residents

9. The development would create a new 1-bedroom flat within the new mansard roof, with its entrance on the floor below, resulting in a 1 bedroom home over 2 storeys. The Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS) requirement for a 1 bedroom home over 2 storeys is 58sqm. Although the proposal would not comply with that standard, the Council has taken a flexible approach and applied the standard of 50sqm for a 1 bedroom home over 1 storey, which the proposal would comply with.
10. The parties are agreed that the proposal would not comply with the relevant internal floor to ceiling height requirements. Although some of the floorspace would exceed 2.5m in height, the higher ceilings would be in the bathroom and circulation spaces, with the bedroom and living room suffering from low ceilings which, would not adequately address the aims of the NDSS and Policy 3.5 (and table 3.3) of the London Plan 2016 which promote adequate floor to ceiling heights.

11. Furthermore, the proposal would not provide any private amenity space, contrary to Local Plan Policy LP29 which requires 5 square metres of private amenity space to be provided.
12. I acknowledge that the site is constrained by the footprint of the existing building, but that does not in itself does not justify diminished living standards for future residents.
13. The overall quality of accommodation would not result in a sufficient standard of accommodation contrary to policy 3.5 of the London Plan 2016 and Policy LP29 of the Local Plan which together require new housing provide an adequate standard of accommodation both internally and externally, and set out minimum standards for new homes.

Other Matters

14. The proposal was refused for non-compliance with Local Plan Policy LP30 which relates to the design of householder extensions. As the proposal is not a householder extension I find that Policy LP30 is not directly relevant and the proposal neither conflicts nor complies with it.
15. The proposal was also refused for non-compliance with Redbridge Local Plan 2018 Policy LP7 which relates primarily to back gardens and resists the conversion of outbuildings or subdivision of gardens to provide new residential accommodation. Policy LP7 is not directly relevant and the proposal neither conflicts nor complies with it.
16. I have placed no weight on Policies LP7 and LP30 as they are not directly relevant, and relevant provisions pertaining to new housing and living standards are contained elsewhere in the development plan.

Conclusion

17. The proposed development would not comply with the development plan, and there are no material considerations which outweigh the harm I have identified. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Jan Slominski

INSPECTOR