



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by Zoë Franks Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3244358

116 Beattyville Gardens, Barkingside, Ilford, IG6 1JZ

- 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 Dr Ashan Sowdagar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2378/19, dated 2 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, double storey side and rear extension, single storey front extension, loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The site is on the prominent corner plot of Beattyville Gardens and Longwood Gardens which are both residential streets. The house is detached and larger than the surrounding predominantly semi-detached properties.
4. The development proposes alterations at every elevation, and the rear, front and side roofs (including an increase in the height of the roof ridges and the volume of roof space). The combined effect of these alterations would be to make a much larger property which would significantly increase the scale and massing of the building, particularly when viewed from Longwood Gardens.
5. The proposed roof, when taken with the proposed first storey side extension and new pitched roof, will look overly large and bulky in the street scene. In addition to the extended roof crown, the proposed roof would have visibly different sloping elements which would appear incongruous. The host property is already much larger than its neighbours, but it is an attractive building and currently sits well in its irregular corner plot. It is stepped down towards the roads by the single storey element at the side adjacent to Longwood Garden, and away from the adjoining plot on Beattyville Gardens by the smaller one storey porch element. This would not be the case if the proposals were

implemented as the proposed two storey side extension would be large in scale and massing and would not appear subordinate to the host dwelling. The proposed flat roof on the single storey front extension would appear incongruous when viewed next to the existing pitched roof front porch and would detract from the attractive design of the porch.

6. The issues outlined above would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the appearance of the adjoining streets, contrary to policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 which are intended to promote good design generally and specifically in household extensions, and also contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan which similarly seek to preserve the character of local areas and promote buildings of high architectural quality.
7. No objections have been raised in relation to the proposed first floor rear extension and ground floor rear extension. However, it is not clear that these elements of the proposal are physically and functionally severable and a split decision is not appropriate.

Conclusion

8. I have identified substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area and I therefore conclude that the proposal is contrary to the relevant development plan policies, the development plan as a whole and national policy. For these reasons the appeal is dismissed.

Zoë Franks

INSPECTOR