
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2024

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/23/3330296

9 Merlin Grove, Hainault, Ilford, Essex IG6 2QX

- 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 and Mrs Parag and Prity Amin against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 1677/23, dated 9 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of first floor rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is set on a curve in the road in a wedge-shaped plot. The side elevation of the extension would run along the angled shared boundary with No 11, above an existing single storey extension.
4. Of particular relevance to this appeal, the Council's Housing Design Guidance SPD (SPD) indicates that the width of extensions should not exceed half the width of the host property and where shared boundaries are set at an angle, proposed extensions should be staggered or stepped to avoid long flank walls that are visible from the street, to ensure that they are subordinate and proportionate. The proposed development would not satisfy these criteria. Nonetheless, it is also necessary to assess the appeal proposal on its own individual merits.
5. The proposed extension would be highly visible between Nos 9 and 11 and would not be 'tucked in' within the street scene as the appellant suggests. Due to its angled profile and bulky appearance, the extension would appear dominating and incongruous, despite its lower ridge, hipped roof profile and set-back from the front elevation. It would not respect or reflect the design of other properties in the surrounding area and would fail to preserve the street scene. Although the design of the appeal property and its neighbours can be described as pleasant, but unremarkable, this does not justify development of poor design quality.

6. I conclude that the angled alignment to the side boundary, the massing and the awkward roof form of the proposed development would result in an incongruous and disproportionate extension. It would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the visual amenity of the locality. For these reasons it would be contrary to the high-quality design aspirations of Local Plan Policies LP26 and LP30 and SPD.
7. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR