
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2023

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3312512

12 Albermarle Gardens, Gants Hill, Ilford IG2 6DJ

- 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 Mrs Jinyan Miao against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2436/22, dated 20 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch extension at 12 Albermarle Gardens, Gants Hill, Ilford IG2 6DJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2436/22, dated 20 July 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6 and 1:1250 scale site plan.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey terraced house which is located in a residential area of similar properties. The house has a 2 storey front projecting bay with a gabled roof over. This and a number of properties in their original state, have a brick arch which accommodated a set back at ground floor and includes the entrance door at one side. Although I can see that this has been

enclosed at the appeal property, and a large number of others, the submitted plans indicate that it is present.

4. The property and the surrounding area lie within the Perth Road Residential Precinct. The Council have applied this local designation to areas within the Borough which they consider to be worthy of enhanced protection but do not satisfy the tests for Conservation Areas. The Council has not submitted any additional information about what qualities the area possesses, nor what enhanced protection should be applied to it.
5. The proposed front extension would be of 3m in height with a small, pitched roof and would be around 0.6m deep. It would enclose the original brick arch and would result in the front door being moved to the side of the extension.
6. The extension would not project as far forward as the existing bay and would appear as a modest addition to the house. I can see that a number of the houses in the surrounding area have filled in the recessed area and many retain the original brick arch. However, within the Precinct a significant number of houses have been extended in a similar way as is proposed within the appeal. These have resulted in the loss of the recessed area and the brick arch (at least visually in views from the road). The appellant's submissions include an example where the Council granted planning permission at 14 Milton Crescent (Ref 1147/22). Although the Council comment that some similar extensions pre-date the designation of the Precinct and some may not have planning permission, the same cannot be said of this recent example. There are also similar examples on Albermarle Gardens, although the planning history of all of these is not clear.
7. The proposal would appear as a modest and subservient addition to the house. It would result in the loss of an original feature but this has been undertaken on a number of other properties within this road and in the Precinct, including a recent grant of planning permission by the Council. Furthermore, in the absence of any specific assessment by the Council as to what features within the area should be protected and in what ways, I find that the proposal would have no overriding harmful effect on the character and appearance of the property and the Residential Precinct as a whole. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policies LP26 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018.
8. In relation to conditions to be applied, the Council has confirmed its preferred conditions within its submissions. I agree that conditions which identify the approved drawings and ensure the use of agreed materials are necessary for the sake of clarity, certainty and to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR