
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3243284

11 Princes Road, Barkingside, Essex IG6 1NG

- 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 Luani Morina against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2867/19, dated 13 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has not objected to the single storey rear extension. From the evidence before me I see no reason to disagree. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No 11 Princes Road (No 11) is a semi-detached property located in a prominent position on the corner of Princes Road and Crown Road. It, like the other corner properties in the vicinity of the site, is angled such that it faces the junction. Princes Road and Crown Road are primarily characterised by two-storey semi-detached properties set back from the road such that the area has a pleasant spacious character and appearance.
4. The width of the proposed side extension would be more than half of the width of the host property. The front elevation of the proposal would be set back by a modest distance from the front of the host building and the proposed ridge would be set down a limited distance from the ridge of the host building. The resultant effect would be that of a significantly enlarged massing of the host building. Therefore, given the prominent position and orientation of No 11, the proposal would appear bulky and incongruous, adversely affecting the spacious character and appearance of the area.
5. In addition, the proposal would result in a two-storey blank façade that, given the orientation of the building, would be further forward from the prevailing building line. Therefore, while I note that the existing side elevation has a single window and the modest projection of the rear elevation, given the

modest set back of the front façade compared with the host building and lack of detailing such as fenestration on the side elevation of the proposed extension, it would appear stark and dominant from the approach from Crown Road.

6. Nos 12 and 16 Princes Road (Nos 12 and 16) have a different form to No 11. While they have two storey side extensions of substantial width, they appear significantly set back from the front of the host buildings such that those extensions do not detract from the spaciousness of the area and street scene. As such, the extensions at Nos 12 and 16 do not override the harm that would result from the proposal.
7. Some of the other properties in the area have been altered such that extensions are a part of the character and appearance of the area. However, given the massing and form of the proposal, it would harmfully affect the spacious character and appearance of the area and the other extensions would not override this harm.
8. Consequently, the proposed two storey side extension would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 March 2018 which seek, among other things, developments that respect the local character of the area and maintains or improves the appearance of the locality or street scene. It would also conflict with the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Adopted September 2019 in this respect.

Other Matters

9. I note the appellant has expressed a willingness to alter the design of the proposed extension. However, I have necessarily assessed the proposal based on the drawings before me. I acknowledge the provision of internal and external space and that no objections have been raised by adjoining owners. However, given the harm identified above, these points have not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

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

R Sabu

INSPECTOR