



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/24/3342651

68 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 Barry Winton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 2980/23.
 - The development proposed is described as the change of roof from hip to gable end and retaining rear dormers as approved.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a first floor flat within a two-storey, double-fronted property, with a hipped roof. The existing property has been subdivided into four flats.
4. 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.
5. The proposed development would involve the extension and alteration of the roof, providing a hip to gable extension, together with a rear dormer extension, which was approved under a separate application¹.
6. 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.
7. Policy LP30 of the RLP states that the Council will support householder development that complements the character of the building, particularly in

¹ Planning Application Ref: 2951/22

terms of scale, style form and materials and incorporates a roof profile and materials sympathetic to the existing dwelling.

8. The proposed hip to gable alteration to the roof would be a disproportionate and unsympathetic addition to the host property that would detract from the original architectural style of the dwelling. It would also appear discordant in the street scene, which as outlined above, is dominated by the presence of hipped roofs.
9. Although I accept that the overall roof height would not be exceeded, and the proposal would utilise materials of a similar appearance to those which are used in the existing property, the proposed development would nevertheless fundamentally alter the shape of the roof, adding significant bulk. As a result, it would appear as an overbearing and dominant addition, which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of host property and surrounding area.
10. I do not dispute that there is architectural variety found within the wider surrounding area. However, the properties on this side of Eastwood Road display a high degree of architectural rhythm and consistency. The consistent pattern of hipped roofs contributes positively 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 character and appearance of the area.
11. Although I accept that there is an example of a property with a hip to gable alteration at No.53 Eastwood Road, I observed during my site visit that this has resulted in the loss of the symmetry of the property and creation of a bulky and inappropriate addition to the dwelling. Furthermore, the other examples found within the immediate area are not reflective of the established character which comprises of mostly hipped roofs and detract from those features identified above which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area, particularly on this part of Eastwood Road.
12. I have had regard to Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, which states that all development must make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises site capacity. The design led approach requires consideration of design options to determine the most appropriate form of development that responds to a site's context.
13. I have also had regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which promotes the efficient use of land, particularly in support of its aim to significantly boost the supply of housing. However, in this particular case, the proposal would provide additional accommodation for an existing property. Therefore, whilst I recognise that the design approach seeks to optimise the use of the roof space by providing additional accommodation for Flat 3, for the reasons set out above, the scale and massing of the proposed extension would fail to respect the character of the host property and surrounding area.
14. 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 Policies LP26 and LP30 of the RLP which seek, amongst other things, high-quality design that respects the local character of the area.

15. 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.

Conclusion

16. 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