



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2017

by C Jack BSc(Hons) MA MA(TP) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3181385

16 Trafford Avenue, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0TF

- 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 Sertac Varis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0415/17, dated 29 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension with loft conversion with new windows and entrance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 16 Trafford Avenue (No 16) is a two storey semi-detached house located in an established principally residential area. The house occupies a corner plot at the junction of Trafford Avenue with Kirkland Avenue. The character and appearance of housing in the area is generally varied and includes bungalows, detached and semi-detached houses of a variety of styles and materials. I saw that many houses nearby have been extended, in an assortment of ways. The appeal site is open to clear public views from both Trafford Avenue and Kirkland Avenue.
4. The proposed extensions and alterations to No 16 would significantly increase the overall scale and bulk of the house. However, from the front the extension would be staggered, meaning it would not appear unduly imposing in the street scene of Trafford Avenue. The design, which would give the front elevation a lateral three-tiered appearance, would not be symmetrical with the cat slide roof feature of the attached house. However, I noted examples of similar extensions nearby and various examples of significant extensions and alterations to other houses that would have originally featured similar cat slide roofs. As a result, I do not consider that the appearance of the front of the proposal would be generally out of keeping with the varied character and appearance of the area, or that the unbalanced size and design with the attached house would be harmful to any significant degree in the circumstances of this case.

5. Notwithstanding this, I have significant concerns that the height, scale and bulk of the two storey side elevation, coupled with its proximity to the boundary with Kirkland Avenue, would result in an unduly imposing built form, out of scale and character with the general pattern of development nearby, and particularly in Kirkland Avenue. This would contrast significantly from the set-back nature of the existing side elevation, which is also substantially more subservient in the streetscene than the proposal would be due to the cat slide roof which results in an existing side wall of only single-storey height presenting towards the road. The existing modest single storey extension, which is positioned closer to the road than the principal side elevation, does not diminish my concerns in this regard.
6. In light of this, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Strategic Policy 3 of the adopted Redbridge Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008, which seeks to ensure a high quality built environment including by requiring all new development to respect the locality generally. It would also conflict with Policies BD1 and BD5 of the adopted Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008, which respectively set out general development criteria including that proposals must be of a building style, massing, scale, density and design appropriate to the locality; and criteria for extensions to dwellings including that they should complement the character of the building, particularly in terms of scale, style, form and materials.
7. The Council's reason for refusal also refers to a Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012. I have not been provided with a copy, however I am satisfied that my decision would not be altered given that I have identified harmful conflict with the relevant policies of the development plan.
8. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to the five nearby extensions referred to by the appellant and I took the opportunity to view these from the road during my site visit. I have found some examples of extensions nearby, including those referred to, to have notable similarities to the proposal in this appeal and I have afforded this moderate weight in my consideration of the proposal in the context of the site and surroundings. However, this is insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified in respect of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Catherine Jack

INSPECTOR