
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by J Williamson BSc (Hons), MPlan, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/19/3228108

GB Foods, 225-227 Ley Street, Ilford IG1 4BL

- 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 Yusaf Polat against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref: 0090/19, dated 30 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 04 April 2019.
 - The development is single-storey rear extension with roller shutter access and relocation of staircase to the above flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for single-storey rear extension with roller shutter access and relocation of staircase to the above flats at GB Foods, 225-227 Ley Street, Ilford IG1 4BL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 0090/19, dated 30 December 2018, subject to the following condition:
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the following approved plans: LS-1208-PRE2, LS-1208-EGR2, LS-1208-ERE2, LS-1208-ESE2, LS-1208-PGR2, LS1208-PSE2, LS-1208-PSS2, Location Plan and Block Plan.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Yusaf Polat against the London Borough of Redbridge. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The extension has been erected and the staircase relocated therefore I am considering this appeal retrospectively.
4. I note the Council refer to a roller shutter being used on the flank elevation of the extension, facing Christchurch Road. In contrast, the appellant suggests that the roller shutter existed prior to the extension being constructed. However, the pre-existing and existing/proposed side elevations plans submitted, indicate that the roller shutter did not previously exist and is included as part of the development. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

5. I also note a reference in the Officer's report to the development being a "temporary structure". However, the appellant's Statement confirms that the development is permanent. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

7. The application site consists of a brick-built building made up of three-storey and two-storey elements. The ground-floor is used as a food retail store and the evidence submitted suggests that at least part of the upper floors is used as flats.
8. The site is located on the corner of Ley Street and Christchurch Road; on the corner opposite the site is a motor vehicle repair/maintenance unit with associated retail on part of its ground-floor. There are a handful of other retail and commercial units located around the road junction; the remaining immediate surrounding area comprises residential properties.
9. I note that the building's brickwork has been painted at ground-floor level, and that the window and door openings at this level have security steel shutters attached. I also note that the motor vehicle repair centre directly opposite the side elevation of the development is constructed of grey corrugated sheeting with roller shutter doors. Hence, the area comprises a mix of traditional and more contemporary development, with commercial properties having a range of additions and alterations which have not always been sympathetic to their original character.
10. The development consists of a single-storey rear extension and an external staircase leading to the first-floor with a walkway link to an additional existing external staircase that provides access to the second-floor. The evidence submitted states that the extension measures 4.5 m deep, extends across the width of the building with a height of between 3.1 m and 3.7 m. The extension is constructed within the boundary walls of what was the rear yard; the side elevations are timber, painted grey, and the roof covering is a grey coloured, waterproof felt material. The staircase is spiral and constructed of metal and steel. The roller shutter is painted metal.
11. The Council considers that the appeal site is located on a prominent corner location and as such the development would be visually prominent in the streetscene. However, although the host building is located on the corner of Ley Street and Christchurch Road, I consider the development itself is significantly set back from the corner.
12. I note from my site visit that when stood on the corner of Ley Street and Christchurch Road, on the opposite side to the appeal site, the external staircase is not visible, and the extension is barely visible given that it only projects between approx. 0.4 m and 0.9 m above the boundary wall with a backdrop of trees behind it. The roller shutter is visible, though this is read simply as one that forms part of the collection of roller shutters located on the building's side elevation.

13. When approaching the development from the opposite end of Christchurch Road, ie from Thorold Road, the development only comes into view from around a third of the way down the street. It is then seen against the backdrop of the building and the other existing external staircase, factors which reduce its visual prominence.
14. Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (RLP) promotes high quality design. The Policy states, amongst other things, that the Council will seek high quality design in all development and that development details and materials should respect or improve local character and the surrounding area.
15. Policy LP9 of the RLP is concerned with ensuring the vitality and viability of Town Centres. It requires, amongst other things, the scale of development to be appropriate to the area and for development to improve the attractiveness of the public realm.
16. The site-specific circumstances and my observations described above are all factors that lead me to conclude that the development does not significantly harm the appearance of the host property, the streetscene or the character and appearance of the area. I therefore conclude that the development accords with Policies LP26 and LP9 of the RLP.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed subject to the condition specifying the plans to which the permission relates, for the avoidance of doubt.

J Williamson
INSPECTOR