



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19th January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3258558

2-2a Strafford Avenue, Clayhill, Ilford, IG5 0TF

- 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 Pellumb Mazreku against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1961/20, dated 2 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as '*retrospective planning application for retention of shared garage roof*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a residential area of Clayhill. The garage is attached to buildings known as Nos. 2 and 2a Strafford Avenue, with the Appellant having submitted drawings demonstrating what planning permission is sought for.
4. The Council's report indicates that the 'existing' garage dimensions are an eaves height of around 2.85 metres and ridge height of circa 4.2 metres. The proposed dimensions would be roughly 3 metres to eaves height and a ridge height in the region of 5.4 metres. These figures are not disputed within the Appellant's Grounds of Appeal, and I see no reason to disagree.
5. The 'existing' dimensions referred to above would not be too dissimilar to those seen at nearby properties; for example No. 4 Strafford Avenue. In direct contrast, the submitted scheme would project almost to the eaves. This would add considerable bulk to the adjoining building; which itself has already been extended from one two storey house, to two houses.
6. The combination of the roof height, eaves height and its width results in unsympathetic further additions to main appeal buildings. The result visually is a further elongation of what was previously a pair of semi-detached dwellings turned into a short terrace. Whilst other buildings have been extended or altered, the result of the submitted scheme in this case is that the garage

would appear as a large and bulky addition to the existing built form. This would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in the area.

7. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. As such it would be contrary to Policies LP23, LP26, LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, as supported by the Housing Design SPD guidance, which amongst other aims seek to ensure that developments respect the local character of the area.
8. I note the Appellant's view that the roof of the garage would 'not pose harm to the amenity of neighbours'. In the main, this is focussed on the distance between the built form and solar path. However, this does not address or overcome my concerns relating to the unacceptable impact on the character of the area in design terms.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Cullum J A Parker

INSPECTOR