



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2019

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3234382

38 Canterbury Avenue, Cranbrook, Ilford IG1 3NE

- 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 Sinniah Sritharan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1205/19, dated 13 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

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. The appeal site is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling located on the corner of Canterbury Avenue and Chelmsford Gardens, set within a suburban area. The property has undergone a number of alterations and this is evident to the rear by virtue of a large dormer window, two-storey extension and single storey extension that projects the full width of the host dwelling.
4. The existing single storey extension projects approximately 3m from the rear wall of the original dwelling, and this application proposes a further projection of approximately 3m to increase the size of the dining and kitchen area. The scheme would incorporate a new part flat, part hipped roof above, to tie into the remaining single storey extension.
5. The gable end of the dwelling is visibly exposed within the street scene from Chelmsford Gardens behind the existing boundary treatment, as is the rear of the property due to the rising land levels along the road and the fact that the rear garden runs parallel to Chelmsford Gardens.
6. A total projection of approximately 6m along the gable of the dwelling combined with the length of the original gable end of the dwelling, would result in an excessively long projection that would be visually prominent from Chelmsford Gardens. Furthermore, the extension would have a high side wall to shallow hipped roof combination, that would not appear in proportion to one

another, which is further harmful to the host dwelling. Therefore, the proposed development would appear as an incongruous and disjointed addition to the dwelling. It would not be subordinate, and neither would it complement the character of the host building.

7. Although the extension would be a single storey, and elements of its design characteristics would match the host dwelling with the use of matching materials, this does not outweigh my findings that the proposed extension would be an unsympathetic form of development that would be contrary to policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted 2018). This Policy, amongst other matters, seeks new development to promote high quality design, to respect and complement local character, have regard to matters pertaining to massing and scale, and development to be subordinate to the existing dwelling. This policy is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in seeking high quality design that is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR