
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2021

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3262103

209 Clayhall Avenue, Clayhall, Ilford, IG5 0NZ

- 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 M Meraj against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 2704/20, dated 26 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is rear roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises what would have originally been a modest semi-detached bungalow with a hipped roof. The original property has been significantly altered and extended to the front, side and rear and by extending the roof space with both a hip to gable extension above the side extension and a large box dormer across the rear. It has also been fully rendered and painted and the roof tiles, windows and doors have been replaced with ones of different colour and materials to the originals. The symmetry and uniformity that clearly once existed in the row of properties (203-209 Clayhall Avenue) has been lost.
4. It is proposed to add a further flat roof extension to the rear of the dwelling. This would be located above the existing single storey flat roof extension and would adjoin the rear of the existing flat roof box dormer. The width would be more than half of that of the existing extended dwelling.
5. The submitted plans show the existing and proposed side and rear elevations of the first floor extensions as being finished in timber or hardie plank external panelling. I noted on site that the side of the existing box dormer is in fact finished in block and render to match the ground floor.
6. The proposed extension, by virtue of its excessive scale, its significant projection from the original rear roof slope and its poor quality, flat roof, box style design would result in a large, mostly blank wall, adjacent to the footway.

Although the contrasting material would break up the appearance of the wall to a small extent, the proposal would result in a large, bulky and unattractive feature on this prominent corner plot, which would further detract from the design of the original pair of semi-detached bungalows and the character and appearance of the wider area.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted March 2018), which seek amongst other things to ensure that extensions are of high quality design that maintains or improves the appearance of the locality or street scene and does not result in a serious cumulative impact on the environmental quality of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR