
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3240784
48 Herent Drive, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0HE

- 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 M Karunanith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3384/19, dated 15 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of roof extension in rear roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of roof extension in rear roof slope at 48 Herent Drive, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0HE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3384/19 dated 15 August 2019 and the plans submitted with it, 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: Drawing no. HD/02 Rev A dated August 2019 - proposed elevations; Drawing no. HD/04 Rev A dated August 2019 - Proposed Roof Plan and Section; Streetwise site location plan dated 04/12/2016, untitled block plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. I have been made aware, by the parties, of the previous appeal decision which allowed a hip to gable roof and dormer extension to the appeal property. At my site visit I noted that the roof extensions have not been implemented. I have taken the details of the allowed appeal scheme into consideration in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached house located on the corner of Herent Drive and Oriel Gardens. The property fronts Herent Drive which is characterised by mainly semi-detached houses of various designs. The rear elevation of the appeal property and its roof are prominent from Oriel Gardens, particularly as Oriel Gardens slopes gradually down towards Herent Drive.
5. Oriel Gardens connects Lord Avenue to Herent Drive, the street is fronted by single storey garages and the side gables of properties facing Lord Avenue and Herent Drive. Because of the low garage buildings along the Oriel Gardens frontage the rear of properties along Lord Avenue and Herent Road are highly visible. As my colleague identified there are some very large rear dormer windows visible in the area and from Oriel Gardens this is particularly so. These dormers can be regarded as a common feature of the area, such that they exercise a significant influence on its character and appearance.
6. The appeal proposal would introduce a second dormer window in to the approved hip to gable extension. This would extend the built form of the dwelling closer to the footpath and Oriel Gardens Street frontage. Nevertheless, in the context of the approved hip to gable extension and the street scene, wherein there are many such extensions which predominate in views along the street, I conclude that the additional dormer window would not, either individually, or cumulatively with the approved extensions, be out of character with the surrounding area.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would sit acceptably with the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area and would accord with Policy LP26 and Policy LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018). These policies seek design that is of appropriate scale, style, form and materials and which respects the character of the area. The development would also accord with the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) September 2019 which acknowledges that each development will be considered on its merits and dormer windows are, in principle, an acceptable approach to extending the roof of a house.

Conditions

8. The standard time limit condition, as well as a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition requiring the external materials to match the existing dwelling is necessary in the interests of local character and appearance.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, taking all matters into account, and subject to the conditions, the appeal is allowed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR