



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2024

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/24/3340465

56 Eastwood Road, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 8UU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Katepalli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 3715/23.
 - The development proposed is described as alterations to front wall. Demolish rear extensions. Two storey rear extension. Remove chimneys. Loft conversion with hip to gable extension and three front rooflights. Change of use from a Nursery into 5no. self-contained (5 x 1 bedroom) flats with associated hard/soft landscaping works, car parking, cycle, waste/refuse storage and amenity space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has confirmed that the appeal site lies outside of the 6.2km Zone of Influence for the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation and that the second reason for refusal was added in error. On this basis the Council are no longer defending this reason for refusal, and I shall deal with the appeal on this basis.
3. I have had regard to the planning history of the site, which includes two previous approvals¹ for the change of use and extension of the appeal building to provide 4no. self-contained apartments. At the time of my site visit, work on the proposed two-storey rear extension appeared to have commenced. I note that the works carried out appear not to accord with the plans submitted with this appeal. However, I need to consider the appeal based on the development applied for and the plans submitted with it. Therefore, I shall deal with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site, No. 56 Eastwood Road comprises a two-storey end terrace property situated on the corner of Eastwood Road and Percy Road. The building has previously been used as a Children's Nursery.

¹ Planning Application Refs: 2813/23 and 1022/23

6. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with the properties on Eastwood Road having a distinct character which typically comprises a symmetrical and repeated design of large, double bay-fronted and hipped roof dwellings with smaller, two-storey side projections connecting the houses. Whilst a number of the properties have been subdivided into smaller units and the side projections separated into individual dwellings, the street has retained its built character, particularly the prominence of hipped roofs.
7. Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted March 2018 (RLP) states that the Council will seek high-quality design that respects the local character of the area, and makes a positive architectural and urban design contribution to its context and location.
8. The proposed development would comprise the change of use from a nursery to provide 5no. self-contained, one-bedroom flats, alterations to the front wall and demolition of existing rear extensions. The development would also involve the erection of a two-storey rear extension, a loft conversion with hip-to-gable extension and three front rooflights. The proposed roof alterations would increase the overall height of the building by approximately 1.1 metres, altering the existing hipped roof to a gable roof and would also involve the removal of the chimneys.
9. The proposed hip-to-gable roof alteration would add an element of variety to the area but would appear as a bulky and harmful addition to the roof profile of the existing property. The proposed hip to gable alteration would be an unsympathetic addition that would detract from the original architectural style of the host property. It would also appear discordant in the street scene, which as outlined above, is dominated by the presence of hipped roofs.
10. I have had regard to the recent grant of planning permission for the demolition of rear extensions, a two-storey rear extension and loft conversion with rooflights. However, whilst I acknowledge that there are some similarities to the appeal scheme, it would nevertheless introduce a roof alteration, which is not in keeping with the roof design of the original property, nor the prevailing character of the area.
11. In respect of the two-storey rear extension, this would be of a similar depth and width to the extension previously approved. However, due to the proposed alteration of the roof from hip-to-gable, the current proposal would also increase the bulk of the two-storey extension. In combination with the proposed alterations to the main roof slope, this would result in a prominent and bulky addition to the host property that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
12. My attention has been drawn to a number of examples² in the wider surrounding area. However, whilst I do not dispute that there is architectural variety within the wider surrounding area, the properties on this side of Eastwood Road display a high degree of architectural rhythm and consistency. The consistent pattern of hipped roofs contributes positive to the character and appearance of this part of Eastwood Road. The proposed alteration of the hipped roof to a gable, would upset this rhythm and cause harm to the

² 46, 50, 53, 54 and 70 Eastwood Road; 12, 22 and 77 Barley Lane; 1-12 Eastmead, Eastwood Road; Goodmayes Methodist Church; 73-83 Douglas Road; 14 and 103 Wellwood Road.

character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, its prominent location on the corner of Eastwood Road and Percy Road means that this roof alteration would appear unduly bulky, particularly in combination with other extensions to the building.

13. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy LP26 of the RLP which seeks, amongst other things, high-quality design that respects the local character of the area.
14. The proposal would also conflict with Paragraph 135 of the Framework which requires development to function well and add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).
15. The Council also cited conflict with Policy LP30 of the RLP. However, this policy relates to householder development and is not therefore relevant in this particular case.

Planning Balance

16. It is not disputed that that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing sites and that the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) indicates that the delivery of housing was approximately 50% of the housing requirement over the previous 3 years. In such circumstances, Paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires that, due to the Council's Housing Delivery Test results, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
17. The proposal would contribute to the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes and would also reflect the aim in the Framework for the effective use of land, particularly brownfield land. Economic and social benefits would also arise during construction and on subsequent occupation. The site has a PTAL rating of 3 and is approximately 640 metres away from Goodmayes train station, with Goodmayes Local Centre located approximately 550 metres away. However, even in the context of the Council's housing delivery issues, the benefits are limited due to the small scale of the development.
18. The scheme would be acceptable in terms of providing satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers, the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, protection of trees and provision of parking, cycle and refuse storage. However, the absence of harm in these respects is a neutral consideration that weighs neither for nor against the proposed development.
19. Set against the benefits would be the adverse impacts of the proposal, in that it would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. The Framework seeks to ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and

effective landscaping, and are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities). I afford this harm significant weight.

20. Therefore, I find that the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given, the proposal would not accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR