
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2017

by Brendan Lyons BArch MA MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 22nd May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3170262

101 Ley Street, Ilford IG1 4BH

- 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 Juned Yunusbhai Memon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 5450/16, dated 18 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 101 Ley Street, Ilford IG1 4BH, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 5450/16 dated 18 October 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan; Plans and Elevations No.3206/03.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the house and of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property sits in an urban location, close to the main shopping area of Ilford. It is a two-storey house that forms part of a long terrace of similar houses. To the rear there is a two-storey 'outrigger' wing, with a shallow pitched lean-to roof. A flat roofed single-storey extension has been added to the end of the outrigger.
 4. Permission is now sought to extend the outrigger at first floor level by some 1.3m, maintaining the existing roof profile and with a window in the gable end similar to the existing.
-

5. The appellant explains that most of the existing first floor of the outrigger is taken up by a bathroom, leaving a virtually unusable confined space to the rear. The proposed extension would allow the formation of a small third bedroom. I accept that this would be a significant benefit to the house's suitability for family occupation, and in that respect would represent an improvement to the local housing stock.
6. Because the extension would maintain the existing roof form and window pattern, it would not be out of character with the house, as feared by the Council. Owing to the modest depth of the proposed rear projection and the relatively low ridge height, I do not share the Council's concern that the extension would form an intrusive feature at first floor level. The house forms one of a row of three matching pairs, all of which retain the original form of their outriggers at upper floor level. However the outriggers of the row of houses immediately to the east already project further than the proposal would, so that there is not a strongly consistent rear building line that would be broken by the appeal proposal. In this context the proposed extension would not be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development.
7. The rear of the house is not open to public view, so that the extension would be seen from only a limited number of nearby residents. The slight disruption to the symmetry of the pair of houses would not be significantly harmful in effect on visual amenity. Similarly, the extension would not be unneighbourly in its very slight effect on light and outlook at the adjoining houses. The appellant has referred to similar projections at houses much further to the east, but I was not able to see these on my visit and I am not aware if they have planning permission, and therefore give little weight to them.
8. Overall, I consider that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the house and of the surrounding area. It would comply with the specific criteria for extensions set by Policy BD5 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document, as well as with the broader design objectives of Policy BD1 of the same document and of Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy.
9. The Council has requested that three conditions be imposed, two of which are the standard conditions on commencement time and compliance with the approved plans, and the third to require materials to match the existing house. I agree that all three are reasonable and necessary.
10. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted subject to those conditions.

Brendan Lyons

INSPECTOR