



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2020

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 November 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3257515

10 Huntsman Road, Hainault, Ilford IG6 3TJ

- 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 Umroa Sarao against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1562/20 was refused by notice dated 21 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling on a prominent corner location. The surrounding area is primarily residential, comprising predominately two-storey dwellings of similar scale and traditional character.
 4. The side extension has been constructed and replaces a previous side extension that was set back from the frontage. It comprises a flat roof extension flush with the main front façade, with a separate entrance and with a side elevation set at an angle to follow the boundary of the site.
 5. The adjoining dwelling has a single-storey side extension, set at an angle with a separate entrance. That extension is narrower in width than the development the subject of this appeal and is set back from the main frontage.
 6. The Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2019) stipulates that the side wall of a single-storey extension should not follow the line of a shared boundary where the boundary is set at an angle. In addition, the SPD stipulates that a separate front entrance door will not be acceptable.
 7. From my observations, due to its size, forward projection so close to the side boundary, the front elevation flush with the main front wall and the separate
-

entrance door, the development appears as an intrusive addition to the dwelling. It appears as a stark prominent addition that is not in keeping with the character or appearance of the existing dwelling. It does not balance the appearance of this pair of dwellings, as the side projection on the adjoining dwelling is a materially more modest addition. Thus, in such a prominent location, the development has an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

8. For the reasons stated above and having taken into consideration all matters raised, I conclude that the development has an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. Thus, the development is contrary to SPD guidance and contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 in the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (2018), particularly where they seek to promote high quality design. I consider these Policies to be broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, where the Framework seeks to ensure good design.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR