



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2021

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3270867

42-44 Empress Avenue, Cranbrook, Ilford IG1 3DD

- 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 Nikhil Vora against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3476/20, dated 20 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear 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 properties and the area.

Reasons

3. The area is dominated by long rows of two storey terraced properties with architectural detailing on their front faces typical of their era. To the rear, some here and on Mayfair Avenue have dormer windows, along with single storey rear projections and other alterations. Consequently, their rear elevations display less cohesion than their front faces, although their original form and character is still generally apparent.
4. Nos 42 and 44 Empress Avenue form part of such a terrace. Both have a single storey rear projection and, contrary to what is depicted on the submitted drawings and photographs, No 44 as well as No 42 now has a large rear dormer window, which extends across the whole of its roof, and which adjoins a neighbouring dormer.
5. The proposed extension would sit above the host properties' ground floor rear projections. Whilst its roof would sit well below the host properties' ridge, its flanks would be set in only slightly from the side boundaries, and its width would thus extend across most of these properties' rear faces. It would therefore have a significant bulk; and taken together with the existing extensions, it would totally dominate the rear face of these two properties.

6. Additionally, the proposal would result in an awkward design, and a complex juncture particularly where its shallow-pitched, hipped roof would cut across the host properties' large rectilinear dormers.
7. The appellant has provided a photograph of a first floor extension somewhere on Mayfair Road. However, I did not observe any rear projections on this terrace of a similar form and bulk to that proposed here. Consequently, unlike most nearby properties, the cumulative impact of this scheme with previous extensions would not enable the properties' original form and character to be read.
8. The extension would be faced with matching materials, and the footprint and orientation of the existing building would not change as a result of this scheme. However, for the above reasons, it would have a dominant appearance; and having regard to the area's prevailing character, it would jar with the generally simpler form and style of the other properties in these terraces.
9. Although the proposal would not be visible in the streetscene or in the public realm, that harmful impact would be seen from many nearby properties, including from their rear gardens.
10. Amongst other things, and in general terms, Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (2018) Policies LP26 and LP30 seek high quality design, which respects the host building and local character with regard to matters such as form and massing; and which require extensions to be subordinate to the existing building and to have a sympathetic roof profile. For the above reasons, the scheme would conflict with that approach.
11. As it is not good design, and it does not accord with the development plan, the proposal does not benefit from the National Planning Policy Framework presumption in favour of sustainable development.
12. Summing up, the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host properties and the area. It would conflict with the development plan and, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR