



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/W/19/3242785

436 Ley Street, Ilford IG2 7BS

- 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 P Pabila against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2938/19, dated 10 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double storey rear and side infill extension including addition of a side dormer to existing rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey rear and side infill extension including addition of a side dormer to existing rear dormer at 436 Ley Street, Ilford IG2 7BS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2938/19, dated 10 July 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: D01, D02, D03, D04, D05, D06, D07, D08, D09.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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 is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached building which has been sub-divided into five flats, located between other residential properties and an electrical substation three-storey building in a busy, urban area. The building currently has a part single, part two-storey rear projection and a rear box dormer window. The proposal includes a ground floor and first-floor extension to the

rear and side of the property and the extension of part of the existing dormer over the flat roof two-storey projection.

5. The first-floor extension would extend the entire width of the rear of the property and therefore would be closer to the southern boundary than the existing two-storey rear projection. However due to its positioning adjacent to a three-storey building, with only a small gap between the two buildings which does not benefit from public access, the extension would have limited visibility from Ley Street and therefore a limited impact upon the streetscene.
6. Although the proposed development would increase the bulk of the property, it would not disrupt any pattern of development in the area, which is built-up and varied in design. The proposal would also be entirely to the rear of the property, with the front elevation to remain unchanged. Therefore, although it is a large addition, due to its typical residential appearance for an urban environment and materials which match the existing building, it would be a subordinate addition and would not be at odds with the character of the host property.
7. The extension of the rear dormer would create a three-storey section to the building, however this would not extend over the entire roof of the building and would still have a large box dormer appearance. Although it would not match the attached dwelling, No.438, these two properties are not currently symmetrical in appearance. Therefore, the proposal would not unbalance this pair of dwellings. Its location, adjacent to a three-storey building, would also ensure that the extended dormer would not appear overly large or out of scale in its setting and would not be a dominant addition to the rear of the property.
8. Although the proposal, as a whole, would significantly increase the overall massing of the appeal property, it would have limited visibility from the streetscene and therefore would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would also improve the appearance and quality of the building as a whole.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would not be in conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018). These collectively seek to new development is of a high-quality design, makes a positive contribution to a coherent public realm, is well integrated and respects the local character of the area and complements the character of the building.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

Conclusions and Recommendation

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

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR