
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2020

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01/03/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3260385

2 Exeter Gardens, Cranbrook, Ilford, IG1 3LA

- 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 Tafajul Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1326/20, dated 5 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of '*1st floor side and rear extension including loft conversion with rear dormer and 2 front roof lights*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of first floor rear/side extension and loft conversion with hip to gable roof alterations at 2 Exeter Gardens, Cranbrook, Ilford, IG1 3LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1326/20, dated 5 May 2020, 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 carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos GA/0041/01, GA/0041/02, GA/0041/03, GA/0041/04, GA/0041/05, GA/0041/06, GA/0041/07, and GA/0041/08.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of the development given in my formal decision reflects the description that was given on the decision notice and which was repeated on the appeal form. This better reflects the nature of the proposal that is shown on the application drawings when compared with that which was given on the application form, and which I have used in the banner heading above. The principal difference is the omission of any reference to a rear dormer, which is

not shown as part of the proposal on any of the proposed elevations or floor plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling within a residential area comprising properties of similar age and appearance. The original form of the property has a barn-hipped roof but with a two-storey, gable-ended, subordinate side wing. This design is repeated along Exeter Gardens although many of these originally similar properties have been altered in a number of ways. In some cases, the hipped parts of the roofs have been changed to gables. In others, the barn-hipped roof has been extended as a full hip over the side wing, including some where side dormers have also been added. As such, the original uniformity of the architecture along Exeter Gardens has been lost over the years, with little symmetry remaining between a significant majority of the semi-detached pairs.
5. The proposal would change the barn-hipped roof to form a gable, with the height of the roof over the side wing raised to around 0.7m below the property's main ridge line. Although the current form of Nos 2 and 4 is symmetrical, this is not obvious within the street scene due to the fairly shallow front gardens of these properties and the inability to view the semi-detached pair as a single building from most angles. Neither is it significant, given the established mixed character of the area.
6. The Council's *Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document* 2019 advises against hip to gable conversions where this would be out of character with the prevailing character of the area or where it would harm the symmetry of a semi-detached pair. Whilst the hip to gable change would alter the symmetry of the building, this would not be openly seen as a negative change for the reason already explained above. Neither would the asymmetrical form of Nos 2 and 4 be out of keeping with the majority of semi-detached pairs in the immediate area. In addition, I saw an example at 14 Exeter Gardens, just a very short distance from the appeal site and on the same side of the road, where the original form of the dwelling had been altered to the front in a manner very similar to the appeal proposal. The change was not mirrored in the other half of the building, but the alterations appeared neither out of keeping nor intrusive, appearing well executed and part of an integrated design for the dwelling.
7. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal would display the design quality needed to appropriately complement the character and form of No 2, and to respect the established character of the local area. There would therefore be no conflict with Policies LP26: *Promoting High Quality Design* and LP30: *Household Extensions* of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030.

Conditions

8. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external materials that are to be used.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I find that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR