



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3240104 200 Tomswood Hill, Ilford, IG6 2QS

- 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 Mrs Rowena King against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3153/19, dated 27 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with Mansard Roof.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. Tomswood Hill, from its junction with Amber Lane to Wannock Gardens adjacent to the appeal site, is of a mixed character and appearance, with a number of housing types, styles and finishing materials. Despite this mixture, and the presence of some hipped and flat roofs, gabled roofs dominate the character surrounding the site, are oriented both towards and along the road.
4. The replacement of the current gable roof with a mansard roof would increase the prominence and apparent bulk of the appeal property. At present, the simple, gable-roofed form of the appeal property is consistent with the character of the area surrounding it. The mansard roof would alter the apparent proportions of the dwelling, giving it in my opinion, a taller and narrower appearance. In my view this would appear somewhat at odds with the established character and appearance of the area. I consider that the proposal, through its roof form and height would also unduly increase the prominence of the appeal site in the street-scene, through the use of a roof form so different in scale and character from those which surround it.
5. At present, the appeal property is somewhat shorter than its immediate neighbour, but owing to the fall in levels along Tomswood Hill, its height appears consistent with and appropriate to the changing levels in the area.
6. I acknowledge that despite an increase in height, the appeal proposal would be no taller than its neighbour. However, this increase in height would be accompanied by a substantial increase in the bulk and scale of the roof. This

increase would not be mitigated by the mansard profile, and in my view, the combination of the increased height and bulk would appear incongruous.

7. Whilst I acknowledge that the area around the appeal site is mixed in character and appearance, I consider that the proposed development would be so strikingly different to that which surrounds it as to be unduly prominent, out of context and therefore harmful to the overall character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant has suggested that the proposal accords with the guidance in the London Borough of Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document, adopted September 2019 (the SPD) and the requirements of the local plan. Whilst the SPD does give guidance on extensions and roof alterations, it also notes that all extensions and alterations should respect the original character of both the host property and the street, including the prevailing urban character. The local plan policies have the same aims. Despite the claims of the appellant that there is no established character and appearance, and that there is no clear design context, I have found above that there is, and that the development would be harmful to it.
9. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (March 2018) and the SPD which seek, amongst other things to ensure that development proposals represent good design which improves the character and quality of an area, respects local character and is well integrated with regard to the layout, form, style, massing, scale and design of the surrounding area.
10. The proposal would also conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework to deliver well-designed places and deliver development which adds to the quality of an area and is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR