



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2020

by Gareth Wildgoose BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3247355
781 Eastern Avenue, Ilford IG2 7RX

- 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 V Ashraf against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4868/19, dated 30 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

3. No 781 Eastern Avenue (No 781) consists of a two-storey semi-detached property located on a corner plot adjoining the junction with Stapleford Avenue. The dwelling has a distinctive flat roofed shared outrigger with No 783 at the front and has been previously extended through an alteration to a side gable roof and a rear dormer with a box style design. In addition, the property has an existing single storey flat roofed rear extension and a modest flat roofed side outrigger. The previous extension to the roof has departed from the typical hipped roof design of No 783, which is similar to other examples of asymmetrical semi-detached pairs further to the east on Eastern Avenue.
4. The proposed two storey side extension would include a first-floor rear outrigger and a single storey rear element beyond that would expand the footprint of the existing flat roofed rear extension. The two-storey extension when viewed from Eastern Avenue would be set back from the front building line of the main house at first floor level by around 0.5m and in that respect would accord with the Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted September 2019. However, it would be contrary to the SPD insofar as the set down from the main ridge of the roof would be less than 0.5m and the width of the extension would exceed half the width of the host property, with only a limited set in from the side boundary. Consequently, although the use of a hipped roof would somewhat reduce the overall bulk and massing of built form and it would utilise a matching tiled roof and render

- finish, the extension would still be viewed from Eastern Avenue as an overly prominent, insubordinate and disproportionate addition to the side of No 781.
5. Furthermore, when viewed as part of the Stapleford Avenue street scene, the substantial cumulative depth, scale, bulk and massing of the different two storey, first floor and single storey elements at the side and beyond the rear building line of the main property would subsume the existing side elevation of No 781. As a result, the extension would be an overly dominant, prominent and incongruous feature above the adjacent boundary fence. The harmful effect would be emphasised by the differences in roof forms of the proposed extension, the existing dwelling and the rear dormer which would draw attention to the side extension as a conspicuous and incompatible addition. The harm would not be mitigated by the set in of the first-floor rear element or the limited visual interest provided by a first-floor side window, whilst the potential for additional screening would be limited by the close proximity of the extension to the existing side boundary. The proposal, therefore, would have an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the host building and the area.
 6. In reaching the above findings, I have taken into account that there are a variety of property styles and extensions along Eastern Avenue and Stapleford Avenue. However, the different styles of development do not justify the harmful relationship of the proposal with the host property, those surrounding and the Eastern Avenue and Stapleford Avenue street scenes. The appellant has also drawn my attention to some specific examples of existing extensions in the wider area, including at Nos. 516 and 534 Eastern Avenue and No 10 Lynton Crescent that are located on corner plots. Whilst I observed that there are some similarities of those extensions with the proposal, the full details of the circumstances which led to those developments being accepted are not before me and in any case, they are distant from the site and have no influence on the character of its immediate surroundings. The presence of those existing extensions, therefore, does not justify the harm that I have identified.
 7. The proposal would have adequate separation distance to neighbouring properties to preserve the living conditions of their occupiers with respect to matters of privacy, light and outlook. Furthermore, the off-street parking and access arrangements for the site would be unaffected. However, the absence of concern in those respects is a neutral factor.
 8. I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted March 2018, and the associated guidance in the SPD. The policies, when taken together and amongst other things, seek that new development is of a high-quality design that respects local character, is subordinate and is well integrated with regard to the surrounding area. The policies are consistent with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Gareth Wildgoose

INSPECTOR