
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 06 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3164672
250 Cranbrook Road, Ilford IG1 4UT

- 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 S Kapoor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2919/16, dated 13 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No. 250 is a detached dwelling located in a predominantly residential area. It occupies a prominent corner site at the junction of Bethell Avenue with Cranbrook Road, a busy main thoroughfare. The proposed extension would wrap around the angle of the dwelling, in part replacing an existing rear extension. It would have a depth of around 4m along the site boundary with Bethell Avenue, a width of around 14m across the rear of the dwelling and a height of around 3.7m.
 4. In my judgement, this side of Bethell Avenue has a distinctive building line which the flank elevation of no. 250 respects. The proposal would extend beyond this elevation by around 4.7m making the proposal a very prominent feature in the street-scene. This would be all the more apparent by the deliberate design conceit of the host and its neighbour at 252 opposite marking a formal entrance into Bethell Avenue.
 5. Against this background, I consider that the scale and position of the proposal, forward of the established building line would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would form an incongruous addition to the street-scene that would be out of scale and character with the host building and the surrounding dwellings at this prominent corner location.
-

6. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy SP3 of the adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008, Policies BD1 & BD5 of the adopted Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 and the advice contained in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document; *Householder Design Guide*.
7. From my assessment, the proposal would not harmfully change the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings in respect of overshadowing, overlooking or loss of outlook and I note the Council raised no objections to the proposal in this regard. In addition, my attention was drawn to a comparable development that was approved by the Council at 252 Cranbrook Road, opposite the appeal site. However, these considerations would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.
8. For the reasons given above and noting the appellant's frustration at how the Council handled the application, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard McCoy

INSPECTOR