
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by S D Harley BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI ARICS

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

Decision date: 10th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3162191
374A and 376A Ilford Lane, Ilford IG1 2LZ

- 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 R Mahandru against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3622/16, dated 4 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extensions and loft conversion with rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue for the purposes of this appeal is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is in the middle of a short row of terraced properties of mixed commercial and residential uses. Nos 374A and 376A are two flats above three commercial units, including a hot food takeaway. The building at No 378 turns the corner with Hunter Road and has two storey and single storey flat roofed extensions up to a shared access that runs between the house at No 2 Hunter Road and the backs of Ilford Road properties. The entrance to 376A is from Ilford Lane whilst that to 374A is from the shared access to the rear. From Hunter Road a large extractor flue can be seen at the backs of the properties.
 4. The first floor frontages above the varied shop fronts of this row of terraced properties are relatively uniform. Although roof lights are proposed facing Ilford Road these would not have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the fronts of the buildings.
 5. The properties in the row all have rear first floor projections. The design of the proposed first floor extensions would not be out of character with the rear elevations of nearby buildings. However, as shown on the plans they would extend some 3m behind the existing first floor rear projections. These existing projections at the appeal site are clearly visible above the single side wall of No 378. Due to their size and position I conclude that cumulatively the proposed first floor extensions, in adding to the existing rear projections, would be dominant and overly intrusive in the street scene as viewed from Hunter
-

Road. Taken as a whole, even though the proposals are uniform across two properties, the proposals would result in over intensive development and would not amount to good design.

6. Concerns have been raised about the way in which the properties are managed and resulting anti-social behaviour. At the time of my visit the gate to the rear access was padlocked shut. From the evidence and my observations during my visit to the area it appears that the properties are not particularly well maintained. Their renovation and the improvements to the living accommodation would be a positive benefit in favour of the proposals. However, renovation and improvements could take place without development of the proposed scale. These matters therefore do not lead me to any different conclusion in respect of the appeal before me.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, on balance, I conclude that the proposed development would not be good design and would have an intrusive and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly I conclude it would conflict with those aspects of Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 and Policies BD1 and BD5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 that seek to ensure developments respect the character and appearance of the local area and host building in terms of scale and size. In not complying with these policies the proposals cannot comply with the development plan taken as a whole.
8. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other relevant matters raised I conclude the appeal should not succeed.

SDHarley

INSPECTOR