

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2016

**by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 4<sup>th</sup> November 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3153496**  
**13 Balfour Road, Ilford, Essex IG1 4HP**

- 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 Mayfair Hotel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref 1010/16, dated 10 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2016.
  - The development proposed is first floor side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

#### *Background*

3. The proposal before me follows the refusal of a similar application for an extension in 2009, residential development in 2010 and the subsequent dismissal of the related appeals in September 2010<sup>1</sup> and March 2014<sup>2</sup>. Whilst each case must be determined on its own merits I have had regard to these previous decisions in the determination of this appeal.

#### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached Edwardian building with accommodation in the roof space in a row of similar properties. It is located close to Ilford Town Centre and is currently in use as a hotel. To the rear is an original outrigger that is subordinate to the host building and it has been extended further by a single storey flat roofed addition, filling in the full length of the extended outrigger to the line of the side wall of the main building.
5. The proposal would extend the width of the existing rear projection at first floor level by adding an upper floor mansard roof extension above the part of the ground floor extension and for the full length of it.

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/W5780/A/10/2127125

<sup>2</sup> APP/W5780/A/13/2210527

---

6. The rear of the appeal property has already been extended and both on its own and cumulatively, it would not dominate the mass or scale of the original or existing building. However, its mansard roof would not follow the profile or pitch of the existing roof arrangement or reflect the form or design of the host property. Despite the fact that the roof slope would be set behind the rear wall of the main building, such a contrasting roof form would be conspicuous through the gap between Nos. 15 and 13 when viewed from Balfour Road and Thorold Road. The proposal would introduce yet another discordant and incongruous roof arrangement into the row and in its context would not represent a design appropriate to the host property or locality.
7. For these reasons, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and area and would conflict with Policy BD1 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 and Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy 2008. Amongst other things these require all development to be compatible with and contribute to the character and amenity of the area, contribute to local distinctiveness and be of a massing, scale and design appropriate to the locality.

### **Other Matters**

8. The appellant's reference to the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') is noted and I acknowledge that the site is in an accessible location, would provide additional tourist and on the evidence before me, additional housing accommodation. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the host property and area. As such, the proposal would fail to fulfil the social and environmental dimensions and it would not therefore be the sustainable development for which the Framework indicates a presumption in favour.
9. I am aware of relatively large individual and cumulative extensions on neighbouring buildings. However, I have not been provided with the full details and moreover such development does not, in my view, justify the harm that I have identified in this particular case. Whilst I am also mindful of the recent appeal history, the scheme before me would appear to be quite different in terms of scale, form and design and is not therefore directly comparable. Accordingly, they do not alter my view in relation to the main issue.
10. The Council's statement refers to the effect on neighbouring properties in terms of outlook. Having visited the site I am satisfied that there would be no harm to neighbouring occupiers in terms of outlook, given the scale and design of the proposal and proximity of neighbouring properties.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons set out above and having considered all other matters raised, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole and the Framework. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Richard Aston*

INSPECTOR