
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2019 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3235380

3 Abbotswood Gardens, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0BG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Kahn against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2033/19, is dated 9 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Abbotswood Gardens predominantly consists of two-storey semi-detached residential dwellings. The architectural features along this road vary, but the bow windows and decorative gable end roofs to the front elevations are a prominent feature. The appeal property and its neighbouring properties differ from this character in that they are two-storey detached properties, but many have the same architectural features as noted above. The appeal property and its immediate neighbours are distinctive in the street scene due to the stepped front elevations. This subservient aspect provides a sense of uniformity.
5. The proposal would eradicate the stepped feature and so would fail to respect the characteristic design of the original dwelling, even if matching materials were used. Combined with a new gable roof form above the extension, it would appear as a significantly sized extension and would not seem to be a subservient feature of the property, detracting from the prominent decorative gable end at the front elevation. Furthermore, the removal of the bow window feature at first floor level would be a detrimental loss from the street scene. Overall, the proposed development would disrupt the uniformity of the street

scene and would be out of keeping with the established pattern and character of development in the immediate surrounding area.

6. The appellant draws attention to other extensions nearby to the appeal site. However, some of the extensions differ in form to the proposal before me, and all the host properties of these extensions are semi-detached houses so are not comparable. In any case, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
7. For these reasons, therefore, the development would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, March 2018, which generally seek to ensure developments are well designed and respect the local character.

Recommendation and Conclusion

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

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR