
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2016

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3156448

38 Cambridge Road, Seven Kings, Ilford, London IG3 8LU

- 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 Neetaben Joshi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2275/16, dated 16 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a part first floor rear extension as office use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part first floor rear extension as office use at 38 Cambridge Road, Seven Kings, Ilford, London IG3 8LU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2275/16, dated 16 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan, drawing numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The name of the appellant in the heading above differs from the name of the applicant on the planning application form. The applicant was stated to be Mr Neetaben Joshi whereas the name of the appellant was stated to be Mrs Neetaben Joshi on the appeal form. Written confirmation has been received confirming that the name stated on the appeal form is the correct one and I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a large, double fronted two storey end of terrace property in use as a children's day nursery. It is located in a prominent corner position at the junction of Cambridge Road and Farley Drive with views of the side and rear elevations of the host building from Cambridge Road. The host building has an existing part single storey part two storey rear extension with the relatively high side brick wall of part of the existing single storey extension marking the side boundary of the site with Cambridge Road. The immediate surrounding area is residential in character mainly comprising properties of a similar scale and appearance to the host building.
5. The proposal would extend the width and height of the two storey part of the existing rear extension. The existing side boundary wall with Cambridge Road would be extended in height but the eaves and ridge height of the proposed extension would be below the eaves and ridge height of the host building, as is the case with the existing two storey rear extension. The roof pitch of the extension would also match that of the main roof of the host building and the extension would be constructed in matching materials. Although the width of the rear extension would increase at first floor, it would not cover the entire width of the host building and it would remain subservient. Consequently I do not consider that the proposal would be an intrusive and un-neighbourly addition out of scale and character with the host building, surrounding buildings or the locality.
6. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. It therefore complies with the development plan and in particular Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy and with policies BD1 and BD5 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development including extensions is designed to a high standard, complements and does not dominate the character of the host building and is compatible with and contributes to the distinctive character and amenity of the area.

Conditions

7. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the extension to be constructed in materials to match the host building. This is having regard to the scale and position of the extension and to protect the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. I have not imposed the suggested condition requiring the first floor side window in the proposed extension to be fixed shut up to a height of 1.7m above finished floor level and obscurely glazed as I do not consider that it is reasonable or necessary. I note that there is an existing clear glazed first floor side window serving an office within the host building. Whilst I note that the extension window would be slightly nearer to properties on the opposite side of Cambridge Road than the existing window, in the absence of any justification from the Council for the suggested condition or any objections from neighbours, it does not appear to me that the proposal would significantly change the relationship between the host building and properties on the opposite side of Cambridge Road.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR