



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 12 October 2021

by Matthew Jones BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 November 2021

Appeal A Ref: APP/W5780/W/21/3278593

18A Rutland Road, Ilford IG1 1EN

- 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 Chana Asset Management Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2090/21, dated 18 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is roof extension including hip to gable and rear dormer extensions.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W5780/W/21/3278594

18A Rutland Road, Ilford IG1 1EN

- 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 Chana Asset Management Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1729/21, dated 21 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing outbuilding into two bedrooms, including formation of linked corridor and reconfiguration of ground floor to existing House in Multiple Occupation.
-

Decisions

1. Both appeals are dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. There are two appeals at this site. Appeal A relates to a hip to gable and rear dormer enlargement of 18A Rutland Road and Appeal B relates to the conversion of an outbuilding behind it to habitable accommodation to be linked to the existing House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) by a corridor. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.
3. Since the appeals were submitted, a new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. The main parties have had the opportunity to provide comments on the revisions therein and I have therefore had regard to the revised Framework without prejudice to either party.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are (i) for both appeals, the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) solely in relation to Appeal B, whether or not adequate living conditions would be created for existing and future users.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. 18A Rutland Road is a fairly new dwelling which has been added to the flank of a residential terrace. The area which surrounds it is characterised by such terraces, which have a degree of decoration to their frontages, with, amongst other things, bay windows with Corinthian column detailing and doorways topped with keystone heads. The terraces also, by and large, have hipped roofs at their flanks. Whilst there are examples of hip to gable enlargements, these are more limited in prevalence and have not come to obstruct the legibility of the hipped roofs as the originally intended characteristic of the roof design.
6. No 18A is narrower and lacking in the fine detailing of its neighbours, and so has a comparatively austere appearance. Where it does assimilate with the character of the area is through its hipped roof, which extends along a two-storey rear projection, set down from the main ridge line of the terrace. This harmonising feature of its design would be lost by the hip to gable enlargement. The dormer would also sit close to the ridge, its bulk would dominate the roofslope, and it would sit uncomfortably atop the rear projection. Overall, this would be a highly obtrusive arrangement.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to several similar alterations to existing houses nearby. However, No 18A is different in that it is a new addition, and of a design which already fails to positively respond to the area in number of respects, an issue that would be significantly exacerbated by the roof works.
8. As such, I conclude with regard to Appeal A that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the design aims of Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted 2018) (RLP), the Housing Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2019) (the SPD) and the Framework.
9. The link corridor within Appeal B would occupy a location where a fence has already subdivided the space in a manner similar to that proposed. Given its relationship to the boundary wall of No 18A's rear outside space, and its reasonably low profile, the link corridor would appear akin to a high side garden wall. As such, it would be an innocuous addition to the street scene.
10. I therefore conclude with regard to Appeal B that the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area would be acceptable. It would accord with the design aims of Policies LP26 and LP30 of the RLP, the relevant guidance of the SPD and the Framework.

Living conditions – existing and future users

11. The outbuilding contains a gym, study, bathroom and store. The replacement of these communal facilities with accommodation for two additional residents would create pressure on the remaining shared space within the property, the reconfigured kitchen. The size of the kitchen would fall below that required by the SPD. Given also its narrow plan and the position of its two doorways, it would fail to function well. For these reasons, it would not successfully accommodate the likely demands that would be placed upon it by its users.
12. The new bedrooms would exceed the minimum space standards for such rooms within HMOs set by the SPD. However, the existing outbuilding fills the rear

space of No 18A's garden and is largely and immediately surrounded by walls and fences. It would be all but enclosed by the further addition of the link corridor. The west side bedroom would have two openings but neither would offer any meaningful aspect. The same is said for the single opening that would serve the east side bedroom, which would look out abruptly on to the link corridor. This means that, even with rooflights introduced, the bedrooms would have extremely limited outlook which would significantly impair the standard of living conditions they would provide for future users.

13. Accordingly, I conclude on this issue that the proposal would fail to create adequate living conditions for existing and future users. It would conflict with the residential amenity aims of Policies LP7, LP26, and LP29 of the RLP, Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2021), the guidance within the SPD, and the Framework.

Planning Balances

14. The schemes in Appeal A and B would add to the accommodation available in the area and would modestly improve the housing mix. However, these benefits would be outweighed by the significant harm that the Appeal A proposal would render to the character and appearance of the area and the failure of the scheme in Appeal B to create adequate living conditions for existing and future users. Consequently, in both cases, there are no other considerations, including the Framework, which outweigh the conflict each scheme would have with the development plan when read as a whole.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and taking all matters raised into account, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed and Appeal B should be dismissed.

Matthew Jones

INSPECTOR