

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2016

by Graham M Garnham BA BPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3161070

1 Netley Road, Ilford, IG2 7NT

- 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 Keith Clydesdale against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 3040/16, dated 23 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that this is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end-of-terrace house. It is situated at the junction of Netley Road, a side road, with Horns Road. The latter is an unclassified but quite busy road that connects south from the suburban housing area around the appeal site towards Ilford town centre. The extension would occupy the full depth of the house, with a new side wall abutting the back of the footway on Horns Road.
 4. The roof of the extension would have a part-hip form with a flat section adjoining the main flank wall of the house. This would have the advantage of minimising the height of the extension, and is a practical design solution to an extension that would be wider at the back than at the front. On the other hand, a disadvantage would lie in not reflecting the simple gable end form of the house and terrace. A planning condition could secure the use of materials and detailing to match the host house. In terms of scale and finishes, though not in form, the proposal would satisfy the general design principles for residential extensions as set out in the Council's *Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document [SPD]* (2012).
-

5. I observed a number of side extensions in the vicinity of the appeal site. Those nearby along Netley Road are either flush with or forward of the front face of the house, and 2 storeys in height. There are also four corner properties where extensions abut the back of a footway, at junctions of Netley Road with Birkbeck Road and Perrymans Farm Road. One of these in particular is of similar design to that proposed at no.1. Thus I find that an extension of the type that is proposed would not be unduly out of character with the locality.
6. However, there is a distinct and important difference between these other examples and the appeal site. The former are all on relatively minor side roads, while the appeal site is on a well trafficked road that is also a bus route and serves commercial premises near its junction with the A12. The side wall of the extension would be just under 7 metres long, of blank brickwork, which I estimate would be over 3 metres high towards its front corner. It would be sited on rising ground, as approached from the south, giving it added prominence in the street scene. Some mature tree planting on the opposite corner of the junction would give a limited amount of screening. This also hides a detached garage, which is the only other form of development I observed abutting the footway along this section of Horns Road. More of the extension would be seen from the north, where the full extent of the wider back elevation would be seen to project forward of the adjoining line of bungalows. I consider that the extension would appear as an intrusive and discordant addition to the Horns Road street scene.
7. I understand that the appellant is an elderly blind person, now living alone, who wishes to remain in the house that he has occupied for some 40 years. Personal circumstances can be a material consideration, though they rarely endure as long as any building works that accommodate them. In this case I consider that there is a sound reason to provide ground floor sleeping and toilet facilities to enable the occupant to remain in familiar surroundings. However, this would give rise to a significant level of harm to the character and appearance of the locality. No evidence has been presented to me that the proposal is the only way in which the appellant's needs could be met, given the size of the property and its plot. On balance, I consider that the personal circumstances of the appellant should not be of decisive or over-riding weight with regard to the proposal before me.
8. I conclude that the proposal would detract significantly from the character and appearance of the locality. This finding would not be outweighed by the subordinate scale of the proposal in relation to the host house or the personal circumstances of the appellant. The proposal would fall short with respect to the Council's SPD and the development plan policies on which the SPD provides guidance. These are Policy SP3 in the Redbridge Core Strategy (2008) and Policies BD1 & BD5 in the Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (2008). A high quality in the built environment is expected, in which new development is compatible with and appropriate to its locality, and extensions complement the character of a dwelling in such matters as style, form and roof profile, as well as in scale and materials.
9. Thus planning permission should be withheld and I dismiss the appeal.

G Garnham

INSPECTOR