



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2022

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/21/3284720

Development site at 1-3 Riverdene Road, Ilford, IG1 2DZ

- 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 Mrs J Schwarzmann against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 2584/21 dated 15 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is fourth floor extension to contain three additional HMO units and increase number of people from 18 to 22 people (summary).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the proposal as I find it more concisely describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character, quality and setting of the Locally Listed Building (Papermakers Arms) with regard to increased scale and massing.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located off Riverdene Road, immediately adjacent to its junction with Roden Street. The site is on the north east side of Riverdene Road, on the corner of the Sainsbury's site which provides a car park, adjacent to a three-storey public house and opposite a row of two-storey residential dwellings. The surrounding area is mainly composed of modest two storey terraces, though there are some tower blocks in central Ilford which can be seen from the site as well as high rise development on the opposite side of the road on Roden Street.
5. The adjacent public house (the Papermakers Arms) is locally listed. At the time of my site visit I entered both the external alley way within the site as well as walking around the appeal site viewing from several points along both Roden Street and Riverdene Road itself. The significance of the public house lies in part in its distinctive design at the prominent corner location which reflects the historic nature of the street scene. I find that it is an important part of the street scene which benefits from its setting. I do not find that the proposal is a subservient, lighter weight, additional storey which would by design result in negligible impact on the setting of this locally listed building.

6. I acknowledge that the existing building is, to some extent, a contrast to the public house in terms of design and that this is a baseline for assessment. Despite this I found the current height of the appeal building, combined with its uniform design, to be sufficiently restricted in terms of scale and massing so as not to dominate the public house as it currently stands. The proposal would exceed the size of the previously approved height for which objection has previously been raised by an Inspector and there are no material changes to the setting of the site which would result in a differing conclusion.
7. The additional storey would have a flat roof and a minor set in but it would, overall, add greater height to an already box-like flat roofed design which I find would provide an even stronger and more stark contrast against the public house's pitched roof, general design and appearance. This would result in a further degree of harm to the setting of the public house. There are high rise buildings in the area, however, their separation from the public house means that they do not over-dominate the public house building or negatively impact upon its setting. There are no buildings on the neighbouring Sainsbury's site which is referenced by the appellant given that that site provides a car park immediately adjacent to the appeal site with, as outlined above, a row of two-storey residential dwellings opposite.
8. I acknowledge that the appeal site is located is within a Tall Buildings Zone and there are high rise buildings in the vicinity including the fourteen storey development which is referenced by the appellant. The appeal proposal is in much closer proximity than any of the high rise buildings in the area and the proposal would result in the additional storey being taller than the ridge height of the public house. The proximity of the proposal contributes to sharp visual contrast. Overall, I find that the proposal, to add a further storey at such close proximity, would appear to dominate the public house and fully detract from its significance by introducing a further large and incongruous element into its immediately adjacent surroundings.
9. In accordance with paragraph 203 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework), I must have regard to the scale of harm and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset. The Framework requires a balanced judgement having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Based upon my findings outlined above I find that considerable harm would arise to the public house from the development as set out above as a result of scale and massing, and this would unacceptably compromise the character, quality and setting of the locally listed building.
10. The proposal would be contrary to Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (LP) Policy LP26 which requires proposals to respect the local character of the area, conserve and enhance the character and significance of the historic environment and complement the borough's heritage assets, and their settings, in accordance with LP Policy LP33. LP Policy LP33 seeks to support development proposals for locally listed buildings but where they preserve the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.
11. The proposal would be contrary to London Plan 2021 Policy HC1 which requires that development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should be sympathetic to the assets appreciation within their surroundings. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 195 of the Framework which

requires decisions to consider the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset and to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal and paragraph 203 of the Framework that requires regard of the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Planning Balance

12. The Council have acknowledged a shortfall in housing delivery within their statement of case. This requires a presumption in favour of sustainable development to be engaged in accordance with paragraph 11 d) ii) of the Framework. Permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.
13. The proposal before me would provide three additional HMO rooms as an extension to the existing HMO which are stated to be for those on lower income. It would not provide any additional homes or planning units (as specifically noted within the Council's report confirming that there are no additional units or self-contained accommodation which would result in no impact on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation). As a result of this the proposal would not contribute to housing delivery in that sense.
14. The proposal is contrary to policies in the Framework which requires regard to be had as to the scale of harm and the significance of non-designated heritage assets. I find that the adverse impacts of the proposal as a result of the impact upon the locally listed building, the Papermakers Arms, would, as outlined above, significantly and demonstrably outweigh the very limited benefits of three additional HMO rooms.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR