
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2020

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3253059
25 Crownfield Avenue, ILFORD, IG2 7RP

- 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 Seyi Salako against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0789/20, dated 8 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single-storey rear extension at 25 Crownfield Avenue, ILFORD, IG2 7RP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 0789/20, dated 8 March 2020, 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 following approved plans: Current Site Plan; Current Ground Floor; Current Side Elevation; Current Rear Elevation; Proposed Rear Elevation; Proposed Side Elevation; Proposed Ground Floor; Proposed Site Plan; Location Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the area around Crownfield Avenue.

Reasons

3. No 25 Crownfield Avenue is an end-terraced house, situated on the western side of the road. It is a two-storey house with a large rear dormer extension, a two-storey side extension and a part two- and part single-storey rear extension. The property has a long rear garden. In common with all of the properties on this side of the road, the appeal site backs onto a large car park that serves Newbury Park station.

4. The proposed rear extension at No 25 would be a full-width, single-storey structure with a maximum depth of 3 metres. It would have a part flat- and part pitched-roof, with the flat-roof element having a height of 3.7 metres. Height to the eaves would be 3 metres. The proposed extension would have materials to match the host property.

Character and appearance

5. Properties along Crownfield Avenue generally have long rear gardens, such that the area has a spacious and open character. The houses on the western side of the road are not overlooked by properties to the rear. Many of the houses in the vicinity of the appeal property have rear extensions of varying sizes, types and materials. These include Nos 21 and 23, which are in the same terrace as the appeal property, and which have long single-storey rear extensions and large rear dormers. No 27 has a smaller single-storey rear extension projecting a similar amount from the rear elevation as the current rear extension at No 25. No 26 opposite has composite extensions, including a two-storey side extension similar in scale to that at No 25.
6. Policy LP26 of the Council's Local Plan (LP) requires that development respects the local character of the area and consists of high-quality details and materials that respects or improves local character. Policy LP30 of the LP requires that householder development complements the character of the building, particularly in terms of scale, style, form and materials, and is subordinate to the existing building in terms of size, scale or height.
7. In this case, the extension would be 3 metres longer than that already existing. This would bring the rear elevation in line with that of the neighbouring No 23, and the height and roof profile would match that of the extension at No 23. From the street, the extension would not be seen, and there are no properties at the rear to overlook the rear of No 25. Moreover, the limited extra footprint involved with the construction of the extension would not seem excessive in this particular case, given the size of the plot. In the light of the prevalence and scale of extensions to properties in the vicinity, I do not consider that this proposal would appear out of character.
8. On this main issue, therefore, I conclude that the extension would respect the character of the surrounding area in terms of scale and materials, and that it would appear subordinate to the existing house. It would not, therefore, conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the LP, and would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area around Crownfield Avenue. Accordingly, I allow this appeal.

Conditions

9. I have attached a condition relating to plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR