

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2017

by M Seaton BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/17/3167328

710 Cranbrook Road, Ilford, IG6 1HU

- 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 Mrs Sidrah Waheed against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4421/16, dated 1 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension. Part single, part two-storey rear extension and vehicular and cycle parking located in front garden.
-

Procedural Matter

1. In addition to the proposed extensions as set out in the description of development, the original planning application also incorporated a change of use to a large House in Multiple Occupation (HMO). However, during the course of the planning application, the scheme was amended to remove the change of use to an HMO, which therefore did not form part of the application for proposed development determined by the Council. Furthermore, amendments were made to the proposed extensions to include a set back from the front elevation, a reduction in the ridge height of the side extension, and also in the width. It is the amended scheme which is before me and upon which this Decision Letter is based.
2. Further to comments made by the appellant's representative at the site visit, I have also sought and received confirmation from the Council that the plans which had been submitted to accompany the appeal are the same plans that the Council had used to determine the planning application.

Decision

3. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal properties and on the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a large previously extended two-storey semi-detached house, set on a corner plot at the junction between Cranbrook Road and Campbell Avenue. The site is set in a largely residential area, although is situated opposite ground floor commercial/retail units on the opposite side of
-

Campbell Avenue, and is adjacent to a parade of commercial/retail units to the North-East on Cranbrook Road. The property possesses an existing rear garden and a detached garage building with access on to Campbell Avenue.

6. The Council has identified that the part single and part two storey extensions to the rear of the property would, on balance, be acceptable in respect of their design and visual impact. On the basis of my observations of the appeal property, I would agree with the Council's assessment. As a consequence, the element of the proposals on which the dispute is between the parties is the two-storey side extension, and it is on this element which I have concentrated.
7. The proposed two-storey side extension would effectively infill the existing gap between the existing dwelling and the fence set on the boundary with Campbell Avenue with a two-storey side extension. I acknowledge that the proposed development would be set down at the ridge and back from the front elevation as a means of promoting subservience to the main dwelling, and would also incorporate matching materials as a means assimilating with the existing building. I also find the detailed design of the extension and roof to be broadly acceptable.
8. However, the proposed extension would intrude into the well-established building line created by the consistent setback of the front elevation of dwellings from the road along Campbell Avenue, which the existing side elevation of the appeal property also respects. This setback contributes to a spaciousness and openness within the area, and which the appeal property and undeveloped forecourt to the side of the commercial unit on the opposite side of Campbell Avenue also contribute significantly towards. Whilst I acknowledge that the position of the existing single-storey detached garage partially intrudes upon the building line, as a consequence of the two-storey nature of the proposals, there would be an adverse impact on the spacious character of the area.
9. The appellant has highlighted that there is no specific design requirement in any of the Development Plan policies or the London Borough of Redbridge Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (the Householder SPD) relied upon by the Council, to set two-storey side extensions in from side boundary lines (on corner properties), and that every case should be judged on its individual merits. However, whilst this may be the case, Policy BD1(1) of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 (the Primary Policies DPD), sets out that *a development proposal must be compatible with and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the area in which it is located*. For the reasons I have already set out above, the proposal does not meet this requirement.
10. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed two-storey side extension would result in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such there would be conflict with Strategic Policy 3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 (the Core Strategy), Policy BD1 of the Primary Policies DPD, and the Householder SPD. These policies seek to advocate high quality design, and require development to be compatible with and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the area.

Other Matters

11. I have noted the appellant's references to previous decisions made by the Council for two-storey side extensions elsewhere within the Borough, where planning permission was granted in what are contended to be similar circumstances. However, the information provided does not indicate how or whether these other schemes responded to the character of the surrounding area, and irrespective of the Council's approach to the decision-making on the earlier planning permission, I have identified harm to the character and appearance of the area in this instance.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

M Seaton

INSPECTOR