



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2019

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3236313

45 Collinwood Gardens, Ilford IG5 0AW

- 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 James Phall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0762/19, dated 28 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 June 2019.
 - The development is proposed extension to rear, side and roof of existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed extension to rear, side and roof of existing house at 45 Collinwood Gardens, Ilford IG5 0AW in accordance with application reference 0762/19 dated 28 March 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PE/01, PF/01 and SP/01.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end of terrace dwelling that is prominently located at the corner of a highway junction. It has a hipped roof and the side elevation of the building is set in from the adjacent footpath. The surrounding area is characterised by buildings of a similar style and this uniformity provides the area with a pleasing suburban quality. Due to the form and appearance of the existing building, it is consistent with the prevailing architecture within the area. In its current form therefore, the site makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
4. However, despite the consistency of architecture within the surrounding area, there are also numerous instances of alterations and extensions to houses within the immediate surroundings of the appeal site. These include large rear dormer windows, hip to gable conversions and two storey side extensions which abut adjacent footpaths. Despite the prevalence of such alterations, due

- to the dominant uniformity found in the area, the extensions complement the prevailing character and appearance. As a consequence, the pleasing suburban environment remains uncompromised.
5. The proposal would introduce a rear dormer window. Whilst it would be a large addition, it would be seen in the context of numerous other dormer windows located to the rear of neighbouring houses. The overall scale and form of the dormer window would be comparable with these other examples, and as identified above, I am satisfied that their presence does not harm the pleasing environment. Consequently, due to its form and scale, this element of the proposal would complement the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
 6. The proposed two storey rear extension would be a wide addition. However, it would not extend the full width of the property and it would also have a lower ridge height than the existing roof. I am therefore satisfied that the form of the original building would not be compromised as a result of this aspect of the proposal. The single storey rear extension would extend beyond the first floor element of the proposal. Whilst it would be a deep addition, due to its limited height, it would have a subservient relationship with the parent dwelling.
 7. The proposed roof pitch of the two storey side extension would not match that of the existing building. This element of the scheme would also result in the loss of a pleasing corner window. Whilst these would not be the most positive features of the proposal, overall the side extension would have a lower ridge height and would be set back from the front of the building. Consequently, I am satisfied that it would have a suitably subservient relationship with the existing building. Although the extension would abut the adjacent footpath, as identified above, such relationships can be found within the surrounding area in a manner that does not harm the street scene. I am therefore satisfied that this element of the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
 8. Finally, although the proposed hip to gable conversion would alter the form of the building, it is a roof form that is easily identifiable within the area and as identified above, these alterations do not detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the surroundings. Based on the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the roof alteration would have a similarly neutral impact.
 9. Consequently, when taken as a whole, I am satisfied that the proposal would form a suitable addition to the existing building and that it would sit comfortably within the prevailing street scene. Therefore, for the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would comply with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (2018) which taken together, promote high quality design and householder development that complements the character of the building.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons identified above, the appeal should succeed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR