
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2017

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3180538
35 Brinkworth Road, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0JS

- 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 Syed Shaheen Ahmed against the decision of the Council for the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1605/17, dated 20 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, in particular the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling which has already been altered, including by a front extension. The property is sited at the junction of Brinkworth Road and Peel Drive which is located within a predominantly residential area of similar semi-detached properties but there are examples of detached dwellings and bungalows. A number of the dwellings have been altered. The property is neither a Listed Building nor is it located within a Conservation Area.
4. The proposed development includes the erection of a canopy porch which would extend from the front door within the existing front extension. Based upon the site visit, within the surrounding area canopy style front additions and porches are not a common characteristic of residential properties. This observation particularly applies to those dwellings of a similar design that form part of the streetscene within which the property is located.
5. The appellant has referred to examples where canopy style porches or front additions have been erected at other properties within the wider area. Although some information has been made available and the properties were visited, the full planning circumstances of these other schemes have not been provided. As noted by the appellant, some of these other canopies and porches do not have the benefit of planning permission, assuming such consent was required. Also, some of the schemes which have planning permission pre-

date the current development plan policies and the guidance on porches and front extensions contained in the Council's *Household Design Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD). By reason of their planning circumstances, only limited weight is given to these other schemes in the determination of this appeal.

6. The SPD includes guidance that porches and front extensions should not project beyond existing dwelling's architectural detailing, such as bay windows. In this case the appeal scheme would project forward of the property's original bay window and would, therefore, conflict with this design guidance.
7. By reason of scale, the appeal scheme would not physically dominate the already altered host property but it would be a further addition to the front extension. The additional degree of projection, width, the vertical emphasis of the columns and the flat roof form would result in a visually intrusive addition to the front elevation. By reason of style and form, the proposed porch would fail to complement the character or appearance of the host property, even as it has been altered, and would not be compatible with the streetscene where front canopies or canopy style porches are not a common characteristic of dwellings.
8. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, in particular the streetscene, and, as such, it would conflict with Policy SP3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document, Policies BD1 and BD5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document and the SPD. Amongst other matters, these policies require development to be designed to a high standard; be compatible with and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of an area; and for extensions to complement the character of the building, including in terms of style and form. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's core principle of securing high quality design. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR