



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3259633

134 Mayesbrook Road, Goodmayes, Ilford, London, IG3 9PJ

- 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 Faruque Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2160/20, dated 15 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a single side and rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policies LP26 and LP30 in the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) and policies 7.4 and 7.6 in the London Plan which seek to ensure that developments are of a high quality design, respect the local character of the area and are of a scale and form that enhances the character of the dwelling. The Council's Housing Design SPD (2018) seeks to ensure that side extensions are less than half the width of the host property and that roof forms match those of the host property.
3. The appeal site has a prominent location on the corner of Mayesbrook Road, a residential street, and the busier Goodmayes Lane where there is a three storey block of shops with flats above close to the rear of the appeal site. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached property on an estate of modest dwellings built as local authority housing to a similar design with hipped roofs and a high degree of uniformity. Some of those hipped roofs have since been altered and some dwellings have been extended. Not all of those extensions integrate well into the street scene but those that do are subordinate in size and scale to the host dwelling with a complementary building form. The appeal dwelling has a lawful hip to gable loft conversion and wide rear dormer with a flat roof. Its adjoining neighbour has been similarly altered.
4. The proposed development is for a single storey, L-shaped extension which would wrap around the rear and side elevations and would have a flat roof. It would be partially screened from view from Goodmayes Lane by the existing fence and hedge along the boundary. The Council has not objected to the rear part of the extension and I agree that given its less prominent siting, its scale

and form would be acceptable. However, with regard to the side part of the extension, its width would be slightly more than half that of the original dwelling, contrary to the requirement of the Council's SPD. This would make it appear disproportionate and out of scale with the existing dwelling. Its flat roof form would be at odds and out of character with the main gabled roof. The lack of a set-back from the front elevation would exacerbate its unsympathetic form and scale, particularly when seen from Mayesbrook Road and to a lesser extent from Goodmayes Road.

5. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension, by reason of its siting, scale and form would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would significantly harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, contrary to the development plan policies referred to earlier.
6. The appellant has drawn to my attention to other extensions in the area that he says have been granted planning permission. Whilst I have no detailed information regarding the circumstances of any permissions, I saw at my visit that the properties referred to are not in corner positions and I am therefore unable to make direct comparisons with this case that would be sufficient to alter my findings. Whilst the proposed development would provide additional accommodation for the appellant's growing family, this does not outweigh the significant harm identified above. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and the appeal is dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector