



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

by M Seaton DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3246259

201 Ashburton Avenue, Ilford, IG3 9EN

- 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 Chaudhery against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4024/19, dated 12 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is single and part first floor side and rear extension. Loft conversion with rear dormer and two roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single and part first floor side and rear extension. Loft conversion with rear dormer and two roof lights at 201 Ashburton Avenue, Ilford, IG3 9EN, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 4024/19 dated 12 October 2019, and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 201-BC-300, 201-BC-301, 201-BC-302, 201-BC-303, 201-BC-304A, 201-BC-305, 0201-BC-307, and 201-BC-308.
 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey end of terrace dwelling set on the north side of Ashburton Avenue, a residential street.
4. The Council's concerns have focused on the visual impact of the roof pitch of the proposed side extension when considered in the context of the roof pitch of the existing roof pitch. In particular, the Council has expressed concern that

the hipped roof of the main dwelling has been shown incorrectly on the existing elevation plans, with the actual roof exhibiting a far shallower roof pitch than as has been shown on the submitted drawings. Furthermore, that the proposed extension would be harmful to the existing symmetry of the dwelling within terrace.

5. I would agree with the Council's conclusion regarding the inaccuracy of the existing elevation plans having had careful regard to the appearance of the existing property. Nevertheless, despite this it is the proposed elevational drawings and roof form which I have considered irrespective of any inaccuracy in the existing plans. In the event that the appeal was allowed and the development was undertaken, it would be beholden on the appellant or developer to ensure that the roof form as shown on the proposed plans, including both the angle of the hipped roof to the extension and that of the main dwelling accord with that shown on the approved plans, including the achievement of a steeper angle of the roof of the main dwelling.
6. In such a circumstance, there would not be conflict with the Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2019 as the 45° angle of the roof of the extension would match that of the angle of the main roof of the house. Whilst I accept that there would be some awkwardness in design terms with the utilisation of a 30° angle on the roof of the rear two-storey element, I am satisfied that this would not be readily visible from the public realm, and in the overall design context of the development there would not result in any significant visual harm.
7. I have also considered the impact on the existing symmetry of the terrace and accept the Council's position in this regard. However, I note that such an unbalanced situation already arises on other properties within the wider area where various different extensions have been undertaken to the side and the roof, including where there have been changes from hipped to gable ends. In this context, whilst clearly not ideal, the unbalancing of the symmetry of the terrace would not be uncharacteristic and I conclude would not result in an unacceptable or visually harmful appearance to the development.
8. For these reasons, the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling or the area. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 and the Housing Design SPD, which seek to promote high quality design and ensure extensions are subordinate and in keeping with the existing character and appearance of the dwelling.

Conditions

9. Further to conditions regarding timeliness and the submitted plans, I am satisfied that a condition securing the use of matching materials would be reasonable in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For these reasons, and subject to the conditions listed, the appeal is allowed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR