



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3241976

175 Breamore Road, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9LU

- 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 Salim Talati against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
- The application Ref 3541/19, dated 9 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2019.
- The development proposed is a part double storey side and rear first floor extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals 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 in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling on a corner plot between Breamore Road and Arundel Gardens. It is located within a dense residential environment which is comprised of semi-detached and terraced dwellings along with a number of flatted blocks. The character of the area is varied in nature and many of the properties have undergone alterations and extensions. The proposal includes a two-storey side extension and a first-floor rear extension.
5. The Council's Housing Design SPD (2019) (the SPD) states that for two-storey side extensions the ridge of the extension should be set down by no less than 0.5m metres from the height of the main ridge and that the first floor element should be set back at least 0.5 metres from the main front elevation of the house, to ensure the extensions appears subordinate to the host property. The side extension would be set back from the front elevation by 0.35 metres and the ridge height would be 0.12 metre lower than the host dwelling. Therefore, the proposal would not be in accordance with this guidance.
6. The two-storey side extension would be located above the existing single storey side extension, whilst also extending further to the front of the property. Due to the corner plot location of the appeal site and the proximity of the extension to the road, the proposed side extension would be highly visible within the streetscene. Although the proposed gable roof form and overall materials proposed would match the existing property, the extension would be a large and over dominant addition to the streetscene. The lack of a sufficient

set back from the front elevation and a similar ridge height to the main dwelling would not result in a subservient addition to the property.

7. The proposed first floor rear extension would be located above the existing single storey rear extension and would adjoin the proposed side extension and an existing two-storey rear projection. As with the side extension, its positioning adjacent to the boundary would result in a highly visible addition from the streetscene, particularly from Arundel Gardens. The depth of the proposal, along with the existing two storey projection, would create an expansive and relatively blank side elevation which would directly abut the road and would result in an intrusive form of development with a bulky appearance.
8. It is noted that the character and appearance of the area is varied, and the proposal would not disrupt any symmetry or visual balance, and that the appellant considers the proposal to be a high-quality addition which enhances the appearance of the dwelling. However, the cumulative scale of the proposed development is considered to result in an overly large addition to the property and, due to the considerations above, would have a significant detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the overall streetscene.
9. For the reasons above I consider that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and therefore would be contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018). These seek to ensure householder extensions respect the local character of the area, is subordinate to the existing building and maintains or improved the appearance of the streetscene. As mentioned previously, it would also be contrary to the SPD 2019.

Other Matters

10. The appellants requirement for additional space to accommodate their elderly parents is noted. However, these are personal circumstances with a limited public benefit and therefore would not outweigh my findings.
11. The appellant has stated that there are similar developments within the area, providing photos of No.177 Breamore Road and another property on the corner of Breamore Road and Woodstock Gardens. Although these properties have been extended, the extensions are materially different to the appeal before me, with the side elevation of No.177 being set back from the road and the other property having a single storey section on the side elevation. Therefore, this would not outweigh the harm previously found.

Conclusions and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR