



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 October 2021

by R Walmsley BSc, MSc, MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3280698

26 Carrick Drive, Barkingside, Ilford, IG6 2LX

- 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 and Mrs A Gold against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1539/21, dated 9 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area.

Reasons

3. The main parties agree that the main area of dispute relates to the first-floor rear extension. Based on the evidence before me I find no reason to take a different view.
4. Policy LP26 of the Local Plan (2018) seeks high quality development that is well integrated and has regard to and respect for the surrounding area. More specifically, Policy LP30 seeks extensions to residential dwellings that complement the character of the building and are subordinate in terms of size, scale or height. The Housing Design, Supplementary Planning Document (2019) gives more specific guidance, stating that the first-floor element of an extension should generally be no more than half the width of the original rear elevation.
5. The first-floor rear extension would be more than half the width of the original rear elevation. Although the extension at this level would not impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers, because of its size it would appear unduly dominant and disproportionate to the host dwelling. In turn, the development would appear unreasonably large and incongruous alongside the neighbouring houses that appear modest in form and scale.
6. The rear elevation of the host property is clearly visible in views from Cumberland Close. Given the form and scale of the extension, it would appear

discordant in wider views and therefore would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

7. Altogether, therefore, I find that the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Local Plan (2018).

Other matter

8. It is not within the remit of this appeal to comment on the events that led the Council to its decision. Any grievances the appellant has in this regard should be directed to the Council.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR