

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2017

by Graham M Garnham BA BPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3171293
150 Eastern Avenue, Ilford, IG4 5AD

- 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 Sheshank Keni-Lotlikar against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 5100/16, dated 26 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is rear extensions to ground floor & 1st floor, internal alterations, windows to side elevation, Juliet balcony/patio doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has raised some concerns about the way in which his proposal was handled by the Council. This matter is beyond my remit, which is to focus on the planning merits of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. I consider that this is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey end-of-terrace house on a wide plot at the junction of Evanston Gardens with Eastern Avenue. It has been the subject of an "in line" side extension, which has had the result of creating a hip-ended, double-fronted house. The rear side has a full width single storey extension with a mono-pitch roof and a central bay feature. The use of matching materials and finishes, and symmetrical front and rear elevations, has given a sense of unity and coherence to the design of the property.
 5. The proposal now is to bring out the ground floor extension a further 2 metres, between the central feature and the flank wall towards the side road; extend above it at first floor level to its full depth (6 metres); and add an upper floor to the central feature, continuing its shape upwards to an angled, pitched roof.
-

6. I consider that the proposal would significantly disrupt the design quality and balance of the back of the house. The new ground floor addition, with a first floor above, would project out further than the existing bay feature, which is the visual focus of the elevation. This, however, with the additional floor above, would have a roof slightly higher than the other part of the extension. Considerable bulk would be added to the rear elevation, forming an unbalanced arrangement with 3 visually competing components. I consider that securing the use of matching finishes by means of a planning condition, and adding a hip end to the first floor element near the side road, would not mitigate or overcome these unsatisfactory design outcomes.
7. The extensions would be clearly visible from the side road, which is characterised mainly by facing rows of houses and hidden rear elevations. I consider that the design failings I have identified would detract materially from this street scene, being prominent within it. The neglected state of the opposite corner property, hopefully not a permanent situation, does not warrant unsatisfactory new extensions nearby.
8. I was also let into the private rear service lane, from where I was able to see into the backs of several houses on Eastern Avenue and Evanston Gardens. I did not notice any two storey rear extensions, while the development of some quite large outbuildings along the lane is not comparable to what is being proposed at the appeal site. The form and style of the extensions would be unusual in the locality, and I consider that they would be at odds with the traditional design qualities of the generally uniform local street scene.
9. I conclude that, by virtue of its size, design and prominence, the proposal would detract significantly from the character and appearance of the property and the area. Such an outcome would be contrary to Policy SP3 in the Redbridge Core Strategy (2008) and Policies BD1 & BD5 of the Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies document (2008). Among other things, these policies seek high standards of design that contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of an area, creating development of an appropriate scale for the locality that complements the character of the building, including in terms of scale, style and form.
10. I consider further that the lack of objection to the side elevation windows, the Juliet balcony and the patio doors, and the possibility of using matching materials, would not counteract or outweigh this adverse outcome. Nor would the absence of harm to the living conditions of adjoining neighbours.
11. Thus planning permission should be withheld and I dismiss the appeal.

G Garnham

INSPECTOR