



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 6 October 2020

by Graham Wyatt BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3252350

68 Cranley Road, Newbury Park, Ilford IG2 6AD

- 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 Dhinesh Thangavelu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0351/20, dated 4 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a "side double storey extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side double storey extension at 68 Cranley Road, Newbury Park, Ilford IG2 6AD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 0351/20, dated 4 February 2020, 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 plans: Block Plan, Site Plan and DRW-01.
 - 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 in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end of terrace property with its flank elevation visible as one travels along Cranley Road from Quebec Road. The site benefits from a side garden area which is triangular in shape and contains an existing single storey extension. It is proposed to replace this with a two storey extension, following the triangular layout of the site and tapering towards the rear of the property.
4. The Council's objection stems from the design of the proposal, notably its angled flank wall and crown roof. I acknowledge that the development would be a somewhat unusual shaped extension, reflecting the triangular shape of the plot. However, I do not find the shape of the site and the resulting extension would lead it to be any more prominent. Although the proposal would be

visible within the street scene, it would nonetheless be viewed as a subordinate addition to the main dwelling. Moreover, notwithstanding that the proposed roof would not follow the design of the existing roof profile, its scale and height would serve to reduce its impact on the host property.

5. Furthermore, given the individual circumstances of the appeal site, and the scale of the development in relation to the main dwelling, I do not consider that the proposal would fundamentally alter the rhythm of the street scene to such a degree that it would not be read as an obvious extension to the dwelling. I consider that it would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and the adjoining area.
6. Thus, the development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area or the host property. It would not be in conflict with Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the London Borough of Redbridge Local Plan 2018 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments are of a good design and high quality, improve the area's character and complements the character of the building, particularly in terms of scale, style form and materials. In reaching this decision I have also had regard to the London Borough of Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019.

Conditions

7. I have considered the suggested conditions in accordance with the Framework and the national Planning Practice Guidance. Along with the standard time condition, the approved plans should also be specified to provide certainty. In order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, it must also be carried out using materials to match the existing property.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is allowed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR