



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 November 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3255324

48 Tavistock Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9BE

- 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 Hassan Masood against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1270/20, dated 27 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor and roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor and roof extensions at 48 Tavistock Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9BE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1270/20, dated 27 April 2020, 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: 0467-03-0100 rev00, 0467-03-0200 rev00, 0467-03-0201 rev00, 0467-03-0210 rev01, 0467-03-0211 rev02, 0467-03-0400 rev02, 0467-03-0500 rev01 and 0467-03-0510 rev02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Applications for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Mr Hassan Masood against the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling located in a residential street largely comprised of other terraced dwellings in groups of four. Many of these properties, including the appeal dwelling, have side extensions which join the separate terraces together, with hipped roofs being the prevalent roof form with similar degrees of slope. While there is a degree of uniformity to the architectural form of properties along the road, with gabled double bays and groups of four dwellings, equally there is wide variety of side extension treatments. The proposal would create a first-floor side extension above the existing single storey side projection with a hipped roof.
6. The Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2019 states that for two-storey and first floor side extensions the angle of the roof of the extension must match the angle of the main roof of the house, and it should be designed in the same form. The proposed hipped roof would match the form of the existing dwelling, however it would have a somewhat steeper pitch and therefore would not comply with this guidance.
7. The appellant has indicated in their appeal statement that the current angle of the roof is 35.19 degrees and the proposed roof angle would be 43.7 degrees. Whilst it clearly does not match the existing dwelling, the hipped roof form would remain and would be in keeping with the prevalent roof forms on Tavistock Gardens. The change in the roof slope would be minimal and would be largely unnoticeable within the built-up streetscene. Therefore, although it would not match the roof slope of the dwelling at the other end of the terrace, this would not result in a significantly unbalanced appearance which would harm the character and appearance of the area and the proposed roof would not be an incongruous addition to the property.
8. As the Council have also highlighted, the first-floor side extension would not be set back or down from the host dwelling as required by the SPD. However, there are several other side extensions within the vicinity of the appeal site which also do not meet this requirement and form a constituent part of the character of the surrounding area, of which the proposal would not be out of keeping with.
9. For these reasons I consider that the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore it would not be in conflict with policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) which require new residential development to demonstrate high quality design which incorporates a roof profile and materials sympathetic to the existing dwelling and maintains the appearance of the street scene.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty and precision. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

Conclusions and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR