

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by K Savage BA MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/19/3242159
163-165 Ilford Lane, Ilford IG1 2RR

- 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 Ms Robina Chohan (Wentworth Estates) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3126/19, dated 26 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's second reason for refusal refers to the submitted plans not correctly reflecting the existing and proposed rear elevations of the building. On site, I saw a deep, ground floor extension had been constructed, but no extension to the original building was visible at first floor level at the time of my visit. This does not accord with the plans before me, which show an existing extension at first floor level. There are further differences in the size and shape of the rear dormer window and the fenestration at ground floor level to the Grange Road elevation. However, it is the submitted plans which form the basis of the application. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal as being solely for the first floor extension and have done so on the basis of the plans before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site stands at the corner of Ilford Lane, a busy commercial thoroughfare, and Grange Road, a residential street of mainly modest, terraced dwellings. The depth of the site means a long frontage is presented to Grange Road, and I saw other corner buildings on Ilford Lane have deep extensions at ground level and extensions of various forms at first floor level.
5. The proposed extension at first floor level would extend to some 11.5 metres depth, roughly twice the depth of the former first floor extension since removed, which appears to have been roughly similar in scale to the consistent first floor extensions at Nos 159-161 and 155-157. In contrast to the substantial extensions at ground floor level, these consistent closet wings at

first floor level maintain an element of the buildings' original form and are a positive feature of the streetscape visible from Grange Road.

6. The proposed extension would project a substantial distance beyond this general building line at first floor level. The side elevation to the street would also stand flush with the ground floor extension below and would span the majority of the width of the two buildings forming the appeal site. In combination with its depth, the extension would form a substantial and imposing structure which would fail to respect the prevailing pattern of development to the rear of the terrace, and would block views of the rear elevations from Grange Road, and vice versa. Together with the deeper ground floor extension, the proposal would physically dominate the building and the streetscape in Grange Road.
7. In this respect, the proposal would conflict with the guidance of the Council's adopted Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (Sept 2019) which states that first floor extensions should generally be no wider than half the width of the original rear elevation to ensure it is proportionate and minimises the impact on adjoining neighbours. I saw that there are a couple of small windows to the rear first floor of No 161, from which the proposed extension would be seen at close range and demonstrably change the immediate surroundings by enclosing the neighbouring building on one side.
8. I acknowledge that No 167 on the opposite side of Grange Road has extended to a significant depth at both ground and first floor level, including a translucent roof to the rearmost part of the building. I have little detail of the circumstances of its approval, apart from it dating from 2002 and relating to a commercial development, with a 2019 permission granting conversion of part of the building to flats. Nonetheless, I saw No 167 to be an imposing and detracting structure in the street scene due to the translucent roof, disjointed fenestration and commercial signage.
9. Moreover, whilst I acknowledge that other corner properties have extended significantly to the rear, I saw that the first floor extension is generally consistent with the depth of other first floor extensions in the same terrace. In this respect, the depth of the development at No 167 appears an exception to this pattern. For these reasons, I do not regard this development, or the other examples put to me, as justification for the proposal, which I have considered on its own merits and found would be harmful for the reasons set out above.
10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed first floor extension would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, there would be conflict with Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) which seeks high quality design in all development which is well integrated and has regard to and respect for the surrounding area in terms of matters such as layout, form, massing and scale.
11. The Council also cites conflict with Policy LP30, which specifically addresses household extensions. The appeal site is in mixed use, and therefore I do not regard this policy as directly applicable.

Other Matters

12. The plans before me indicate that the extension would contain parts of two residential flats. However, the application form indicates there would not be a

net gain of residential units as a result of the development. The additional floorspace may provide for more living space compared to previous flats which may have existed in the building, but this would be a very minor benefit which would not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would result in conflict with the development plan which is not outweighed by other material considerations. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

K Savage

INSPECTOR