



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/23/3319329
38 Howard Road, Ilford IG1 2EX

- 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 Afshan Ebrahim against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0126/23, dated 15 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as a double storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposals on:
 - (i) the character and appearance of the terrace, and
 - (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 36 Howard Road, with particular regard to outlook and natural light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey terraced house which is situated in an area comprising terraces of houses of similar age and appearance. Like many other houses in the area the property has a single-storey rear extension, and a full-width dormer has been added to the rear roof slope to form accommodation within the roof.
4. The proposal would comprise the replacement of the existing full-width rear addition with one that would extend roughly twice as far into the garden together with an addition at first floor level to create an extra bedroom. This element would extend a shorter distance beyond the original rear wall of the house than the single-storey part and would be set away from the boundaries shared with the properties to either side. It would have a pitched roof with a rear-facing gable.
5. Whilst the terrace of which the appeal property forms part has been altered at ground level, and to a lesser degree at roof level, the original building line at

first floor level has been maintained and therefore a degree of the original unity on the terrace remains. In this context, due to its siting, height and form, the first floor extension would be an overly prominent, alien and incongruous element that would be out of keeping with its setting.

6. For this reason the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the terrace. It therefore fails to accord with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018). Amongst other matters the former seeks high quality design that makes a positive architectural and urban design contribution to its context and the latter supports householder development that is subordinate to the existing building in terms of size, scale and height.

Living Conditions

7. The ground floor part of the proposal would extend a significant distance beyond the original rear building line of the terrace therefore resulting in a reduction in outlook from, and natural light to, ground floor rear windows serving 36 Howard Road. This would be exacerbated by the proposed first floor addition which would also impact on light to and outlook from a nearby first floor window in No.36. Overall, due its siting, height and rearward protrusion the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.36.
8. For these reasons the proposal fails to accord with Local Plan Policy LP26 which requires that development does not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

9. In conclusion, for the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR