



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2019

by M Heron BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/19/3237133

2 Selborne Road, Ilford IG1 3AJ

- 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 Iqbal Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2317/19, dated 27 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with hipped to gable roof and rear dormer with roof lights to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Selbourne Road is a residential street characterised by rows of two storey, terraced, properties. These have projecting gable features to front which incorporate bay windows. Many nearby end of terrace dwellings are constructed under hipped roofs. The common architectural design of properties within this part of the street gives them a strong sense of rhythm and uniformity. No 2 is positioned at the end of a row of terraced dwellings. Its overall design, including its hipped roof, harmonises with surrounding built form.
4. To facilitate a loft conversion, the proposal seeks planning permission for a hipped to gable roof extension, a rear dormer window constructed under a flat roof and three front roof lights. The Council raise no objection to the proposed roof lights and, having visited the site, I see no reason to conclude otherwise on this matter.
5. Nevertheless, the proposed roof extension would result in the loss of the hipped roof. In my view, the replacement gabled roof would appear out of character with the roofscape of this part of the street and would disrupt its architectural rhythm and uniformity. In addition, whilst sufficiently set in at both sides and set away from the roof ridge height and the eaves, the proposed rear dormer would occupy a significant proportion of the width of the roof. Consequently, I find that it would be an overly large, dominant, addition

to the roof that would unacceptably erode the simple rear elevation of No 2. This would reinforce the scheme's harmful appearance, which would be readily apparent from within Selborne Road and from the rear gardens of several nearby properties.

6. I accept that a number of properties in Selborne Road, York Road and Northbrook Road have had hipped to gable roof extensions. However, in the absence of details about how such developments were assessed, they carry little weight in my assessment of the appeal scheme, which I have performed based on its individual planning merits. I also note that the proposal would preserve living conditions at surrounding properties. Nonetheless, this would not diminish the harm identified above.
7. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that extensions compliment the character of the building and that developments are of a high quality of design, respect local character and make a positive contribution to their location.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the advice of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweigh this conflict. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Heron

INSPECTOR