



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2020

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3243519

203 Horns Road, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1DE

- 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 Ms Sally Gambrell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3924/19, dated 7 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear extensions, first floor side extension, loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - ii) the living conditions for the occupants of 201 Horns Road.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is an end of terrace dwelling with a hipped roof, a common design feature of surrounding buildings. At roof level, the proposal would convert the hipped roof into a gable end and introduce a large dormer window to the rear that would fill the majority of the converted roofspace. However, the dormer window would not breach the ridge or eaves height and although it would abut the shared boundary with No 201, it would be marginally set in from the edge of the roof. Accordingly, some of the original form of the dwelling would be retained and the building would still appear as a two storey structure with a converted roofspace, rather than a three storey property.
4. Such generous dormer windows are not an uncommon feature within the locality and where they are apparent, I am satisfied that the form of the houses have not been unduly compromised. Based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to arrive at a different conclusion in relation to this aspect of the proposal.
5. However, the development would also include a two-storey side extension and despite the proposed hip to gable conversion on the main dwelling, the

extension would have a hipped roof with a demonstrably shallower roof pitch than that of the existing building. Due to the conflicting roof forms, as well as the differing roof pitches, the side extension would not integrate well with the existing building. Moreover, because the adjacent terrace is set further back from the road than the appeal building, the proposed side elevation would be prominent when viewed from the street. As a consequence, the incongruous and jarring roof form would be prominently expressed within the public realm. This would be to the detriment of the pleasing form of the existing building and the broader terrace of houses.

6. My attention has been drawn to extensions and alterations at 197 Horns Road. Although I am not fully aware of the status of these works, based on my observations on site, the roof profile of that side extension is materially different to that proposed in this development. Accordingly, this example has not influenced my findings.
7. Consequently, for the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to accord with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (LP), as well as guidance within the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD), which taken together and in relation to the main issue, promote high quality design in household extensions.

Living conditions

8. The proposed rear extension would be a deep addition. However, it would principally have a flat roof. Accordingly, this would limit the overall bulk and mass of the extension when viewed from the neighbouring property. The nearest window of the neighbouring property to the proposed extension is a wide, full height opening. Therefore, although the extension would be large and close to the shared boundary, I am satisfied that the window would still allow for daylight to be received as well as providing an outlook away from the extension.
9. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions for the occupants of 201 Horns Road. It would therefore comply with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the LP and guidance within the SPD. Taken together, these seek development which respects amenity and avoids adverse impacts on neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

10. I have found that the proposal would not harm the living conditions for the occupants of the neighbouring property. However, this does not alter nor outweigh my findings in relation to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, a matter to which I attribute significant weight. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR