



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2019

by Christopher Butler BA(Hons) PG Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/18/3217675
175A Beehive Lane, Ilford IG4 5DX

- 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 Shahid Iqbal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3065/18, dated 23 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The submitted appeal form specifies Mr Shahid Iqbal as the appellant, whilst the planning application form submitted with the planning application stated the applicant was Mr Saj Khan. Clarification on this matter was sought and it has been confirmed that the applicant and appellant is Mr Shahid Iqbal. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. This part of Beehive Lane has a pleasant character formed by two-storey semi-detached properties under hipped roofs. They have an attractive two storey bay feature to their frontage that is under a gabled roof, which hips back into the main roof slope. A limited number of these properties, including the appeal property, have had hip to gable roof alterations, but the predominant roof form in the area, which is a strong characteristic of the area generally, is the original hipped ends. Within the surrounding streets the properties are generally two storey terraced dwellings, where the end of terrace properties have hipped ends.
5. The appeal property is located on the western side of Beehive Lane and, along with number 175, forms the northern half of a symmetrical semi-detached building. The appeal property is 'T' shaped with the bottom of the 'T' forming the boundary with the other half of the semi-detached building. The top part of the 'T' is formed by a bay window under a gable roof projection to the front and

- a two-storey hipped roof projection to the rear. There is a flat roofed dormer window in the rear roof slope of this part of the building.
6. In addition to the above, a single storey flat roof rear extension has been erected between the rear elevation of this part of the appeal property, the south side facing wall of the two-storey rear projection, and the common boundary to the south. Above the flat roof rear extension is a small first floor rear projection that extends out from the main property. This rear projection contains a window and door under a shallow glazed roof that ties back into the main roof slope of the property. The other half of this semi-detached property, located to the south, has a similar small first floor rear projection. The proposal seeks to replace this existing first floor rear projection at the appeal site with a larger first-floor flat roof rear addition.
 7. The proposed development would be visible from the gardens of adjoining residential properties and publicly visible from Radnor Crescent. There are no similar first floor flat roof additions in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site and I consider that due to the height, depth and prominent position of the proposed first floor extension, the flat roof design would result in an incongruous addition, out of character with the simple original appearance and form of the rear elevation of the property.
 8. The proposal would therefore be visually intrusive and dominant, especially when viewed from adjoining gardens and Radnor Crescent. As such it would be detrimental to and at odds with the character of the existing building and the prevailing pattern of development in the surrounding area, as described above.
 9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a first-floor extension at number 185 Beehive Lane, advising that it was granted permission in 2011. I have not been provided with any specific details of that planning permission and am not aware of the planning background to that case, which appears to predate current national policy in the Framework and Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 - 2030 (Adopted March 2018) (RLP). Irrespective of the above, I noted during my site visit that 185 Beehive Lane is of a slightly different design and the first-floor rear extension does not have a flat roof. As such I do not consider that either that property or its first-floor rear extension to be directly comparable to the appeal submission, and in any event each case must be considered on its own merits.
 10. The proposed first floor extension would be a visually intrusive and dominant form of development at odds with and detrimental to the original simple character and appearance of the building and the prevailing pattern of development in the surrounding area. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the RLP, which seeks to ensure high quality design that respects and integrates well with the surrounding area, especially in terms of scale, form and design.

Conclusion

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

Christopher Butler

INSPECTOR