



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 DECEMBER 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3283077

149 Wensleydale Avenue, Clayhall, Ilford, IG5 0ND

- 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 Hassan Banna against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2650/21, dated 18 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is single and part two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed which reflects that used by the Council in their decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is one of three houses at the end of a turning head. It is a semi-detached 2 storey house set back behind a front paved area used for off street parking. The existing house has a 2 storey side extension and an adjoining single storey open sided storage area.
5. On the approach to the turning head there is a small terrace of houses on one side and Claybury Park on the other. There are trees and open land to the rear of the appeal site which joins onto Claybury Park. A small gap between the appeal property and the neighbouring terraced house, No 147, allows glimpses of trees to the rear. This gap, and the park to the side of the turning head, separates the group of 3 houses from the other residential properties and contributes to the street scene.
6. The proposal development comprises a 2 storey side extension that would project beyond the rear of the house, a single storey side extension joined to it that would replace the existing storage area, and a single storey rear extension. The Council concluded that the proposed single storey rear extension would be

acceptable. Also, although the proposed single storey side extension wall would not run parallel to the original house, as required by the Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD), because the existing storage area is already angled along the side boundary wall the Council concluded that the single storey side extension would be acceptable too. I agree with the Council's conclusions in this regard.

7. The Council is concerned that the 2 storey side extension and its rear elevation would appear excessive and disproportionate harming the appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Policy LP 26 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (LP) requires extensions to be subordinate to the existing building and respect the SPD in this regard. The SPD indicates that 2 storey side and rear extensions should be no more than half the width of the host property. Side extensions should not exceed the depth of the existing building and the ridge height should be no less than 0.5 metres below the main ridge. The proposed development does not meet any of the above guidance.
8. Although the existing side extension already exceeds half the width of the original dwelling it is stepped back at ground floor level and again at first floor level and does not exceed the depth of the original house. Consequently, it appears subordinate to the host dwelling. The proposed side extension would be stepped back at ground floor level but not again at the first floor. As a result, the increased width would be more apparent from the street and reduce the gap between it and No 147 that I have identified as contributing to the street scene.
9. The side wall would be substantially deeper than the original dwelling. I appreciate that views of it, and the rear of the house, would be limited to immediate neighbours and would not harm their outlook. Nonetheless, the extensions would dominate the side and rear elevation of the house adversely affecting its character and appearance. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the LP and the SPD which require good design that complements the character of the existing building, is subordinate to it and maintains or improves the street scene.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to other examples of extensions in the vicinity of the appeal site including those highlighted by the appellant. In the case of the recent appeal,¹ the extensions were at the rear of the property with no impact on the street scene. Other examples either predate the LP and SPD, do not appear to substantially exceed the depth of the host property, or have a different design to that of the proposed development. As such they are not directly comparable with it. In any case, I have come to my own view regarding the development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere.
11. A neighbour raised concerns regarding the effect of the proposed development on levels of daylight in their garden, and outlook. However, these do not add to my reasons for dismissing the appeal.

Conclusion

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

¹ APP/W5780/D/19/3241310

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR