



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2020

by **P. D. Biggers** BSc Hons MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 January 2021

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3258905**

**71 Stoneleigh Road, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0JE.**

- 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 Haroon Suleman against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
  - The application Ref 1455/20, dated 21 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2020.
  - The development proposed is erection of two storey side extension, part single storey rear extension and part single storey front extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surroundings of Stoneleigh and Gayfere Roads.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the northern side of the junction of Stoneleigh and Gayfere Roads. The houses in the vicinity are two storey semi-detached finished in render under tile roofs. The houses on this side of Stoneleigh Road follow a consistent building line although the two corner houses either side of the junction (Nos 71 and 69) have side elevations to the main house that stand slightly forward of the front building line in Gayfere Road. Both properties also have single storey side extensions on the Gayfere Road frontage. That to No 71 stands off the plot boundary by about one metre and is only about half the depth of the main house whilst that at No 69 is full depth and extends to the plot boundary.
4. It has been put to me that other properties in the vicinity have similar 2 storey side extensions to that proposed and that this justifies the appeal proposal. I noted that certainly there was a very similar design of side extension to that proposed under construction in Chadacre Avenue opposite the north end of Stoneleigh road but in that case the house is not on a corner plot and has simply extended into the space between the house and its neighbour. Although the side extension to No 69 extends out to the back of footpath it is only single storey and is not quite as deep an extension as that proposed at No 71. I am not persuaded therefore that other proposals in the immediate area are similar and I will consider the appeal proposal on its own merits.
5. I accept that the proposed side extension would be stepped back at first floor from the frontage and stepped down from the ridge of the main house in order to

appear subordinate. However, given that the host dwelling has already been extended with a hip to gable roof extension complete with box dormer to the rear, the cumulative effect of the proposed side and rear extensions, together with the existing extensions, would amount to disproportionate additions out of scale and character to the original house.

6. Moreover as the side extension would extend to the plot boundary and the back of footpath on Gayfere Road and rise to a full 2 storeys with a largely blank elevation apart from 2 small windows and extend to a total depth of 12.3 metres it would appear overbearing and intrusive viewed from the road. Given its prominent location on the corner plot it would also have an enclosing effect on the junction reducing its openness to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. The rear single storey extension taken in its own right would be acceptable as it would not project much more than the existing single storey rear extension to No 73. However, whilst it is possible for me to issue a split decision on an appeal allowing the proposals in part, in this case, because the rear single storey extension would be physically part of the 2 storey side extension and also functionally linked to it, I cannot issue a split decision.
8. The *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) at paragraph 127 requires that developments must be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character to create high quality buildings and spaces amongst other things and in these respects the proposal fails. The *Redbridge Local Plan* (RLP) at Policy LP26 reflects the Framework in requiring development to respect local context and local character. Specifically, in respect of extensions, Policy LP30 of the RLP requires proposals to maintain or improve the appearance of the locality or street scene. For the above reasons the design of the proposed extension would conflict with these policies.
9. To assist in the implementation of these design policies the Council has produced the *Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) which provides guidance for householders considering extensions. The guide makes it clear that, in the case of 2 storey side extensions, the extension should not extend to a greater depth than the original house and, on corner plots, should be set in from the side boundary. The proposal would fail to observe either of these guidelines and would appear out of scale and character with the existing house and the pattern of development.
10. For the reasons above, the design objectives of Policies LP26 and LP30 and the SPD would not be achieved by this proposal and it would be unacceptable in terms of the impacts on the character and appearance of No 71 itself as the host dwelling and of the surroundings on Stoneleigh Road and Gayfere Road.

#### *Other Matters*

11. I have had regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in the Equality Act 2010 and understand the appellant's wish to provide extended and improved accommodation and that in doing so he is seeking to make sustainable and effective use of an existing dwelling, an objective which is encouraged by the Framework in Section 11. I acknowledge that this national policy objective makes the principle of extending existing houses acceptable. However, paragraph 122 in the same section of the Framework states that this should not be at the expense of maintaining an area's prevailing character and setting. Sustainable and effective use of the dwelling would not therefore outweigh the harm to the character and

appearance as a result of the proposal or justify an exception to the policies and guidance in this case.

**Conclusion**

12. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the matters before me but for the reasons above the appeal should be dismissed.

*P. D. Biggers*

INSPECTOR