



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2022

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23RD May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3284656
75 Forest Road, Ilford IG6 3HA

- 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 Pellumb Mazreku against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2928/21, dated 8 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2021.
 - The proposed development is extension of existing roof to form balcony on first floor; new front roof element at loft level; alterations to fenestrations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a modern detached dwelling located on the corner of the access road into the local leisure centre. Forest Road is characterised by older terraced dwellings that are sited much closer to the road and form a continuous built frontage either side of the appeal site and adjoining access road. In contrast to the prevailing pattern of development the dwelling on the appeal site is set back some distance from the main road and from the rear elevation of the adjoining property, No 73 Forest Road.
4. The proposed extension and alterations would all be on the front elevation of the dwelling facing towards Forest Road and, obliquely, towards the rear of the adjoining property, No. 73, which as noted above is sited some distance forward of the dwelling on the appeal site.
5. The proposed balcony at first floor level would be created by extending the existing front gable feature over the flat roofed porch enclosed on both sides with brick walls to create a covered balcony. A glass railing would be provided across the front with new door leading from the bedroom.
6. This first floor addition to the front of the property would be readily seen within the street scene. However, it would reflect the design and appearance of the existing gable feature and would remain proportionate to the overall scale of the dwelling. It would result in a forward projection that is deeper than those generally found on the nearby terraced properties. However, due to the siting of the dwelling on the appeal site some distance back from the road frontage, it

is not obviously a part of the continuous built frontage created by the adjoining terraces and therefore would not appear out of keeping nor would it be unduly large or dominant. Overall, I consider that it would be a complementary and proportionate addition to the existing modern house.

7. The proposed balcony at roof level would be created by the addition of a new pitched roof gable which would extend over the proposed new balcony and which would be enclosed fully on two sides with a brick 'parapet' wall to the front. This would be accessed from the existing room contained within the roofspace via a new door.
8. In contrast to the smaller and lower roof addition, this would introduce a large and dominant feature at roof level, its visual impact exacerbated by the solid brick parapet wall to the front. The new gable roof would be much larger than the existing front gable and given its higher level, overall design and prominence in views from both the main road and from the adjoining access road, would fail to be sympathetic to the scale and appearance of the existing dwelling and the wider street scene.
9. For the above reasons I find that, overall, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host property and wider area, in conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) and Policy D4 of the London Plan which seek to ensure that development is of high quality design that respects local character, is well integrated with the local area and subordinate to the existing dwelling. For these reasons it would also fail to satisfy the guidance in the Council's Housing Design SPD (2019), to which the Appellant has made reference, which seeks to ensure that front extensions are proportionate in scale and sympathetic in character, minimising visual impact.

Conclusions

10. I have had regard to the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and find that it would not accord with its policies that seek well-designed places that, amongst other things, function well and are sympathetic to local character.
11. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR