

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2017

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3172622
70A Ilford Lane, Ilford, London IG1 2LA

- 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 A Wahid against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 5283/16, dated 9 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey second floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effects on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 - The effects on the living conditions of the occupiers of 72 Ilford Lane, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance of the surroundings

3. No 70A comprises an addition to the rear of 70 Ilford Lane which is at the end of a three-storey terrace where the ground-floor parts fronting the main street provide a parade of commercial uses and the upper floors are in residential use.
 4. Third floor residential accommodation has been provided in the roof-space of No 70 with the addition of dormer windows. The additions to the rear step down successively at three, two and one storeys along the Bengal Road frontage where the ground floor has a financial services use and the upper floors are flats.
 5. The proposal is to extend the second floor flat further to the rear to provide it with a second bedroom. As existing the development at the rear provides a stepped reduction in roof heights which provides a satisfactory visual transition between the taller Ilford Lane frontage and the lower, two-storey terraced housing along Bengal Road.
-

6. By extending the three-storey element of the rear addition the proposal would detract from this stepped diminution in roof heights, which currently provides a degree of visual relief to the built frontage along Bengal Road. By adding to the overall mass of the rear additions this proposal would erode this visual relief and remove the satisfactory graduation in scale.
7. Although this proposal is not within a conservation area and affects no listed buildings the effect of the increased mass would appear visually overbearing and detract for the amenity of the locality generally. This would conflict with Council's aims for the built environment as set out in Strategic Policy 3 of the Redbridge Core Strategy of 2008 (RCS).
8. The proposal would be an extension to a flat, an existing dwelling, and so Policy BD5 of the Council's Borough Wide Primary Policies of 2008 (BWPP) is considered to be applicable. The increase in the extent of the third storey proposed would dominate the existing building in respect of its size and height contrary to the requirements of Policy BD5. Furthermore, for the reasons set out, the proposal would be of a mass inappropriate to the locality and not be compatible with the amenity of the area and therefore contrary to the objectives of BWPP Policy BD1 as applying to all development.

Living conditions of the occupiers of 72 Ilford Lane

9. Regarding the effect on the next door flat, the proposal would not result in any overlooking or loss of privacy as no windows would face in that direction. Situated to the north the proposal would not result in loss of direct sunlight to the window of the next door flat. The outlook from No 72 appears already to be compromised by the existing additions to its rear and therefore this proposal would not have a materially harmful impact by being unduly overbearing.
10. Therefore I find no conflict with RCS Strategic Policy 3(f) and BWPP Policy BD1 in respect of this proposal failing to respect the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given the proposal would be of harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to the Council's development plan policies. These policies are consistent with those of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of pursuing sustainable development through seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built environment. This proposal would not gain the support of these policies and consequently I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR