



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2023

**by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 23 August 2023**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/23/3317413**

### **135-141 Cranbrook Road, Ilford IG1 4PU**

- 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 Ken Judge & Associates Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
- The application Ref 3357/22, dated 5 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2022.
- The development proposed is removal of existing external rear staircase with single storey rear structures, construction of two storey rear extension, formation of rooms within roof space, internal alterations including alterations to existing hip end roof to create 8no. self contained residential flat units with associated refuse, recycling and cycle storage area.

---

## **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## **Background and Main Issues**

2. The Council in their second reason for refusal make reference to the neighbouring site being 137-143 Cranbrook Road. However, Nos 137 and 141 form part of the appeal site and the submitted block plan shows the neighbouring property to be No 143. It has not been clearly articulated how the outlook for the occupiers of Nos 137 and 141 would be affected by the proposal. Therefore, the main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
  - character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property; and
  - living conditions of the occupiers of 143 Cranbrook Road, with regard to outlook.

## **Reasons**

### *Character and appearance*

3. Cranbrook Road is a mixed-use area comprising traditional terraces and modern infill development. There is commercial space on the ground floors and residential flats above. While there is variety in the street as a whole, the appeal site forms part of a row of traditional terraced properties. Despite some differences in appearance, the terraces are in general harmony with each other in terms of their character and appearance and there is uniformity in the roofscape, owing to the consistency in hipped roofs which creates a clear sense of balance. There are also similar terraces continuing on Cranbrook Road on the other side of Beal Road. The symmetry of the terraces in this section of Cranbrook Road is a key feature in the street and contributes positively to the

character and appearance of the area. At the rear there are a number of extensions of varying design and storeys which has an irregular appearance.

4. The creation of a gable ended roof at the appeal properties would be an incongruous addition and a jarring element compared to the existing sloping hipped roofs. The proposal would result in the properties having an awkward presence, being prominent in the roofscape and detracting from the consistent roof lines in this section of the street. Moreover, it would unbalance the otherwise harmonious character and appearance of the terraces.
5. The rear extension would be the full width of the appeal properties, have a considerable depth and at three storeys would be an imposing feature that would not be subordinate to the appeal property. The appeal scheme may well align in depth with a planning permission at Nos 129-133, however I note that this relates to the demolition of the existing properties and replacement with a modern new building. As such, the context of the example differs in overall appearance and relationship with the street scene. Even if the proposal would be similar in depth and width to existing neighbouring extensions these are only single storey whereas the appeal scheme would be three-storeys in height. The other examples do not, therefore, lead me away from my above findings.
6. The proposal seeks to make the best use of land by optimising the site's capacity. However, it would not enhance the local context or relate positively to local distinctiveness owing to the scale, appearance and shape of the proposed development in views along Cranbrook Road and from Beal Road. While the proposal would have materials to match, and despite the sloping roof at the rear it would, nevertheless, be a bulky and prominent addition to the appeal property in these views. I observed the taller building nearby to the appeal site which would form part of the context for the appeal proposal in views from Beal Road. However, the main focus in these views would be of the traditional terraces in the foreground, against which the proposal would look harmfully out of place.
7. It is indicated that a previous scheme at the site allowed at appeal could be constructed, and this is a fallback position. However, that scheme has not been found to cause harm and accords with the development plan. Consequently, I find the suggested fallback position to have limited weight in the determination of the appeal.
8. For the above reasons, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property. This is in conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) and Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (RLP). Amongst other things, these policies require development to be the most appropriate form that responds to a site's context and capacity for growth, and to be of a high quality of design that enhances and relates positively to an area's character and quality.

#### *Living conditions*

9. It is not disputed that the appeal scheme would not be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of the properties to the rear of the site on Mansfield Road. However, the proposed rear extension would be on the shared boundary with 143 Cranbrook Road and would be of a significant length, which would be experienced from the second floor window at No 143. The depth and height of

the proposed extension would result in a noticeable difference in the built form and appear as a dominant and oppressive feature. Moreover, there would be a relatively narrow gap created between the two-storey extension at No 145 and the proposed development, creating an enclosing effect, to the detriment of the outlook experienced by the occupiers of No. 143. Even if the second floor of No 143 is not currently in residential use, the overbearing effect caused by the proposal would still result in a narrow outlook from this room, which appears to only be served by one window.

10. Consequently, the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 143 Cranbrook Road, with regard to outlook, in conflict with Policy D3 of the LP and Policy LP26 of the RLP. Amongst other things, these policies require development to deliver appropriate outlook which does not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

### **Other Matters**

11. The appeal site is located within the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation zone of influence, afforded protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. However, there is no need for me to consider the implications of the proposal upon it because the scheme is unacceptable for other reasons.

### **Planning Balance and Conclusion**

12. The Council concedes that it cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. In such circumstances, paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) indicates that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
13. The proposal would assist in remedying the shortfall in housing supply by delivering eight new homes on a previously developed site in a location which is accessible to services and facilities. The main parties agree that the dwellings would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupants and that satisfactory cycle parking provision and refuse and recycling storage can be achieved. However, the harm to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers is such that the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme.
14. Therefore, the proposal would not constitute sustainable development in terms of the Framework. Accordingly, I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations to indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
15. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

*F Harrison*

INSPECTOR