



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3240511
32 Inglehurst Gardens, Ilford IG4 5HD

- 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 Dylan Popovic against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3406/19, dated 23 August 2019 was refused by notice dated 18 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with a rear dormer. Hip to gable roof alterations. Three front roof lights. First floor side and front extension. Alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion with a rear dormer, hip to gable roof alterations, three front roof lights, first floor side and front extension, and alterations to fenestration at 32 Inglehurst Gardens, Ilford IG4 5HD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3406/19, dated 18 October 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:

2019.046.PA – 01; 2019.046.PA – 02; 2019.046.PA – 03; 2019.046.PA – 04; 2019.046.PA – 05; 2019.046.PA – 06; 2019.046.PA – 07; 2019.046.PA – 08; 2019.046.PA – 09; 2019.046.PA – 10; 2019.046.PA – 11; 2019.046.PA – 12; 2019.046.PA – 13; 2019.046.PA – 14; 2019.046.PA – 15; 2019.046.PA – 16; 2019.046.PA – 17; 2019.046.PA – 18; 2019.046.PA – 19; and, 2019.046.PA – 20.
 - 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, unless otherwise specified in the approved application.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of proposed development shown on the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form is more precise than that shown on the planning application form. I have therefore used this description in the banner heading and determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, which is located on the eastern side of Inglehurst Gardens. The street predominantly consists of 2-storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings. A range of extensions and alterations are evident in the street scene, which includes front extensions, 2 storey side extensions and hip to gable roof extensions. In many cases, the side extensions have resulted in buildings adjoining and any gaps are generally quite modest. Due to the varied roof forms and extensions, there is not much uniformity in the street scene.
5. The proposed 2 storey side extension would be flush with the main front wall of the dwelling, which would not accord with the guidance in the London Borough of Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019 ('SPD'). However, the side extension would be modest in width and the upper floor part would maintain a gap to the boundary with No. 34 Inglehurst Gardens. This would limit its prominence in the street scene.
6. The proposed development would be comparable to the design and form of the adjacent 2 storey side extension and hip to gable roof extension at No. 34. It would therefore sit comfortably alongside the adjacent building in the street scene. Furthermore, the semi-detached pair comprising Nos 30 and 32 already appears unbalanced in the street scene due to the existing 2 storey side extension at No 32, which projects to the front. Having regard to the varied character of the street scene, the proposal would not cause significant harm to the semi-detached pair.
7. In respect of the rear element of the proposal, I note that rear dormers are commonplace in the area. No. 34 has a large rear dormer, and the adjoining dwelling at No. 30 has a large gabled 2 storey rear extension set just below the ridgeline of the main roof. Whilst the proposed rear dormer would not be fully compliant with the guidance in the SPD, it would provide a set in from the ridge; eaves; and the sides of the roof. Furthermore, the windows of the proposed dormer would align with the first floor windows below. It would also be finished in tiles to match the main roof. In context of the roof alterations and dormers that are evident in the area, the proposed rear dormer would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 - 2030, which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new extensions are of high quality design, complement the character of the building, subordinate, and incorporate a sympathetic roof profile. Whilst there would be some conflict with guidance contained in the SPD, this is outweighed by the lack of harm that the proposed development would cause.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved

plans. This is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In order to maintain the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the external surfaces of the development to be finished in materials to match those used in the existing building.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR