



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3308751

44 Colvin Gardens, Wanstead, Redbridge, London, E11 2DD

- 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 & Mrs Jason Flack against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1739/22, dated 25 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2022.
 - The development proposed was described as "*Retention of changes to roof profile (construction of gable end roof above two-storey side extension), deviating from planning permission ref. 4387/15, Two-story side / rear extension with bay windows, and alterations to front porch*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for hip-to-gable roof alterations over two-storey side extension at 44 Colvin Gardens, Wanstead, Redbridge, London, E11 2DD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1739/22, dated 25 May 2022.

Procedural Matters

2. My formal decision reflects the description of development that was used by the Council in their decision notice and which was repeated by the appellants on the appeal form. This is an accurate but more concise form of words compared with those that were used on the original application form and which I have quoted in the banner heading above.
3. The application was made retrospectively and at the time of my visit I saw that the development was complete.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the hip-to-gable change upon the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene.

Reasons

5. No 44 Colvin Gardens is a two-storey, end of terrace dwelling within a wider residential area comprising properties of broadly similar age and type. The appeal property has been extended to the side at roof level with a hip-to-gable alteration. There is a step to the alignment of the property's side elevation meaning the rear half of the building, extending backwards from the apex of

the side gable, is recessed approximately 1m, creating an asymmetrical arrangement.

6. Whilst the original design for the houses in the area obviously included hipped roofs, I saw during my visit that hip-to-gable changes were fairly prolific along Colvin Gardens and the wider locality. I also saw some other very significant roof alterations and side extensions to some properties that were highly visible and prominent within the street scenes. These all contribute to a now established mixed character for the area, and one that is removed from the symmetry and regimentation that would have once prevailed.
7. As an end terraced property, and one that is located close to the junction between Colvin Gardens and Elmcroft Avenue, the side elevation of No 44 is exposed to view. Nevertheless, I found the changes that have been made appeared no more prominent than many others of significance in the locality, including those at 82 Elmcroft Avenue, a property immediately adjacent to the appeal site which has been obviously extended to the side at two-storey, up to its side return boundary along Colvin Gardens, and which has a very large and prominent rear facing dormer window. This stands as an obvious example of many significant changes that demonstrates how these have been assimilated into the area.
8. When seen from the front, the step to the side elevation at No 44 is shielded from view such that the property appears as a fairly typical end of terrace with a conventional hip-to-gable change that is characteristic in the area. Although the stepped side elevation is unusual, it is not overt. With a pitch to the front and rear roof slopes, I do not find the configuration to be especially awkward or visually harmful within the street scene. There is no loss of symmetry to a semi-detached pair and given the mixed roof profiles that are established as part of the prevailing development pattern for the area, the hip-to-gable change in this instance offers no conflict with the guidance contained within the Council's *Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019*.
9. Overall, I am satisfied that there is no harm to the character or appearance of the appeal property or the wider street scene. As a consequence, there is no conflict with Policies LP26 or LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted in 2018, as far as they require the design of development, including house extensions, to be high quality, respectful and complementary to an existing building and an area's character.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, the Council has suggested conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans and in materials to match the existing. However, as the development has already taken place, I have no reason to impose any of these.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR