



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2020

by M Madge DipTP, MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3244772

16 Stoneleigh Road, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0JB

- 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 Aqeel Zia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3183/19, dated 30 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of a detached garage and erection of a three bedroom dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The appellant's statement of case (SOC) includes an extract of a layout plan depicting access and parking arrangements for the existing and proposed dwellings; identified as Fig.3. This plan is a partial revision of Drawing Reference – 117-B, which the Council's reason for refusal was based upon. Fig.3 seeks to address the Council's third reason for refusal. As the Council has had an opportunity to comment on this plan, they would not be prejudiced by my acceptance of this revised parking proposal.
3. The front garden, immediately in front of the existing dwelling, has been paved since the application was lodged.
4. Since the submission of the appeal, the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) mitigation buffer has been extended from approximately 0 - 3 km to 0 - 6 km. The Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation Mitigation Strategy requires a financial contribution to be made to mitigate any adverse effects of development on the integrity of the SAC.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - (i) the character and appearance of the locality; and
 - (ii) highway safety, having regard to car parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The existing property is an end of terrace two-storey dwelling located in an elevated position above Stoneleigh Road. The prevailing character of dwellings along this side of Stoneleigh Road is terraces of two storey dwellings set well back from the highway, interspersed with large gaps that provide a sense of space between properties and break up the built mass of the buildings.
7. The existing property has recently been refurbished and other properties in the terrace have also been altered in some way, such as the provision of a canopy over their front door and/or new windows. The exception to this is 6 Stoneleigh Road, which has also been provided with a two storey side extension that projects forward with a front facing gable. Notwithstanding these alterations and extensions, the terrace retains its traditional proportions and an inherent symmetry overall.
8. The proposed dwelling would have an elongated floor plan as a result of the narrowness of the site and accommodation is proposed over 3 floors. The third floor accommodation, in the roof space, would primarily be located in a large rear dormer, which would dominate the roof slope. The first floor accommodation would partially be located within a large rear projection. While the existing property has been extended and now incorporates a similar scale first floor rear projection and dormer, the proposed first floor rear projection and dormer would be out of keeping with the existing dwelling as originally constructed. I accept that these particular features would not be visible from the street, but they would still be out of keeping with the traditional proportions and inherent character and scale of the existing terraced dwellings.
9. A forward projecting gable is proposed across part of the frontage and the appellant suggests that this would be similar in size and shape to the extension at No 6. The proportions of that extension are however similar to the width of its associated dwelling. Furthermore, its window configuration replicates those of all the dwellings in the terrace, maintaining a visually balanced appearance to the terrace.
10. The proposed dwelling would be significantly narrower than the existing dwellings and it would have a stepped frontage. The width of the forward projecting gable, in conjunction with the narrower window style, would be out of keeping with the existing dwellings, which would unbalance the visual appearance of the terrace. The proposed design of the dwelling, coupled with its elevated position would therefore result in an incongruous development in the street scene, at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the locality.
11. The existing property and its neighbour, 18 Stoneleigh Road, provided one of the large gaps between the terraces, a key characteristic of the street scene. No 18 has however been extensively extended, with a hipped roof two storey extension that extends up to the appeal site boundary, and its contribution to spaciousness and breaking up the massing of buildings has been lost. While a token separation would be maintained between No 18 and the proposed dwelling, the resultant reduction in spaciousness between dwellings would visually harm the established character and appearance of the street scene.

12. The proposed development would include a side gable wall immediately adjacent to the existing hipped wall at No 18. The juxtaposition of the proposed roof form with that of No 18 would result in an unsympathetic transition between the properties. Furthermore, while the dwelling would be constructed to meet other regulations and “in a sustainable way”, this would not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
13. The development would not respond to the site constraints in a positive manner, resulting in it having a cramped appearance that would be dominant, incongruous and visually intrusive in the street scene. The development would materially harm the character and appearance of the locality. For the reasons set out, the development would conflict with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2016) and Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (2018)(Local Plan), which seek, amongst other things, to promote high quality development that respects the scale and proportion of existing development and spaces.

Highway safety

14. Policy LP23 of the Local Plan seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that developments meet minimum and maximum parking requirements and do not involve a reduction of existing off-street car parking provision. As originally proposed, the development would remove the access and parking facilities for the existing dwelling and provide an unacceptable and excessive width of dropped kerb and parking provision for the proposed dwelling. This would displace parking demand for the existing dwelling on to the highway and the extent of the proposed dropped kerb would further reduce on-street parking provision.
15. The proposed arrangements shown in Fig.3 of the appellant’s SOC however, provide for the dropped kerb to be relocated towards the existing dwelling’s retained frontage and for it to be reduced in width. The existing and proposed dwellings would each be provided with a single on-site parking space. The forecourt directly in front of the existing dwelling has already been block paved. While the proposed access would be a little wider than the existing access, this coupled with the proposed on-site parking provision for both dwellings, would result in the development having a minimal effect on the availability of on-street parking provision.
16. Vehicles entering and leaving the parking area serving the existing dwelling, as shown in Fig.3, would however have to, at least partially, cross the driveway serving the proposed dwelling. This could lead to stationary vehicles in the carriageway, preventing the free flow of traffic and causing a potential hazard to other road users and pedestrians, due to the proposed layout of the access and location of the dropped kerb. The development has the potential to have an adverse impact on highway safety because of the proposed car parking arrangement.
17. While an acceptable access and parking arrangement could be achieved for both dwellings, I remain unconvinced that the proposed vehicular access arrangement would not cause detriment to highway safety. For this reason, the proposal would conflict with Policies LP22 and LP23 of the Local Plan, which seek, amongst other things, to reduce traffic congestion and provide adequate car parking provision.

Other Matter

18. Regulation 63(1) requires an Appropriate Assessment to be carried out where the competent authority is minded to give consent for the proposed development. As I find that the development is unacceptable for the reasons set out above, there is no need for me, as the competent authority, to carry out an Appropriate Assessment.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

M Madge

INSPECTOR