
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2021

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3251847

224 Eton Road, Ilford, IG1 2UN

- 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 Azizul Haque against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0476/20, dated 12 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is single and part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are its effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of residents.

Reasons

3. 224 Eton Road is a two storey end of terrace house located on the south side of Eton Road. The surrounding residential properties have some degree of architectural cohesion in the style of their front elevations, with a variety of forms of bay windows and porches, some of which may be original but others appear to be later additions. The rear elevations are typically plain, but much altered, with a variety of large flat roofed single storey extensions and several full width flat roof dormers.
4. The relevant policies in this case include LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (the local plan) which relate to design and household extensions and, among other things, seek to protect neighbouring occupiers from development which would result in an adverse impact on their amenity.

Living conditions

5. The proposed single storey extension to the existing 3 metre rear extension would result in an overall projection from the original rear wall of the house of 6 metres. The neighbouring property at No. 226 has no rear extension and a somewhat narrower garden than that at No. 224. No. 228 beyond has a single storey rear extension of approximately 3 metres. The appeal proposal would create some increase in the sense of enclosure at No. 226. However, I consider that this would not be unacceptable as the southern orientation of the

rear of the properties would allow for a high level of light and sunlight to continue into the rear garden and rooms for most of the day.

6. The proposed first floor extension would be relatively modest in size and centrally located in the rear elevation and I consider that it would not have an adverse effect on the neighbouring residents.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the neighbouring residents and that in this respect it is consistent with policies LP26 and LP30 of the local plan.

Character and appearance

8. The proposed ground floor extension would amount to an increase in the overall size and mass of the built form at the rear of the property. However, in the context of the wide variety of extensions to other properties in the area, I consider that it would not be uncharacteristic of the local pattern of development.
9. The proposed first floor extension, although modest in scale, would not be in keeping with the overall architectural style of the area because of its flat roof. The appellant has drawn my attention to a similar sized first floor extension nearby. That has a hipped roof which is more in keeping with the prevailing roof form in the area. The various flat roofed dormers in the vicinity are out of keeping with the prevailing roof form, but these may have been constructed some time ago and without the need for planning permission.
10. I conclude that although the proposed ground floor extension is acceptable, the proposed first floor extension would be an incongruous addition, harmful to the character and appearance of the area. In this respect it would be contrary to local plan policies LP26 and LP30.

Conclusions

11. I have found the proposal acceptable in respect of its impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. However, this does not outweigh my concerns regarding the harm to the character and appearance of the area of the first floor extension.
12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR