
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2020

by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/3241902
52 and 54 Fairfield Road, Ilford IG1 2JL

- 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 Mohammad Razwan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3659/19, dated 16 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of first floor rear extensions at 52 and 54 Fairfield Road, Ilford IG1 2JL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3659/19, dated 16 September 2019, and the plans submitted with it, 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 approved drawings: Site Location Plan, N.A/52-54FR/301 Issue A, N.A/52-54FR/302 Issue A, N.A/52-54FR/303 Issue A, N.A/52-54FR/304 Issue A, N.A/52-54FR/305 Issue A, N.A/52-54FR/306 Issue A and N.A/52-54FR/307 Issue A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a terraced building. The surrounding area is predominately residential in character, with Fairfield road characterised by two storey terraced and semi-detached properties. A number of the properties in the area have extensions to the side and rear, as such there is a variety of built form in the area.

4. The proposal is for the first floor rear extension to the terraced building and would not be a visible part of the street scene to the front of the property. The design and materials of the proposed extension would match that of the existing building.
5. The proposed extension would be set back from the existing ground floor extension and would have a lower roofline than the host building. In these ways the proposal would be subservient to the host building. Whilst I note the proposal would be over half the width of each respective property, the overall mass of the proposal, in relation to the proportions of the building, would not be out of scale, overly dominant or oppressive.
6. I note that first floor extensions are not a common feature within the local area. However, due to its proposed proportions and materials, the proposal would be proportionate and subordinate to the host property. Therefore, it would not appear as an incongruous feature.
7. I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. Therefore, it would accord with policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) and the Housing Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2019). These policies and guidance seek extensions to be subordinate to the existing building in terms of size, scale or height and respect the local context.

Conditions

8. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered against advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
9. In addition to the standard condition, which limits the lifespan of the planning permission, I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition relating to materials is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

D Peppitt

INSPECTOR