
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: 08 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/23/3327977

20 Kirkland Avenue, Clayhall, Redbridge, Ilford, IG5 0TQ

- 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 Dinesh Weragoda against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 1587/23, dated 2 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is first floor part rear extension
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor part rear extension at 20 Kirkland Avenue, Clayhall, Redbridge, Ilford, IG5 0TQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1587/23, dated 2 June 2023, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: CAD 17-219 series - Location Plan, Block Plan, Proposed Floor Plan, Proposed Side Elevation, Proposed Roof Plan, Proposed Floor Plan and Proposed Rear Elevation.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house that has already been extended at the rear at ground floor, first-floor and roof levels. The proposal is to extend the part first-floor rear extension across the full width of the house.
4. Of relevance to this appeal, Section 3.2.2 of the Council's *Housing Design Guide* states that the width of a first-floor rear extension should generally not exceed half the width of the original rear elevation to ensure a proportionate

and subordinate extension. The proposed development would exceed this width, increasing the mass of development at the rear of the dwelling.

5. There is a full width first-floor extension at the rear of No 18 Kirkland Avenue, which is the other half of the semi-detached pair. The Council indicates that this extension was constructed over 4 years ago without the benefit of planning permission and confirms that it is immune from planning enforcement action. This breach of planning control does not set a precedent for similar development to be repeated. However, the neighbouring extension is a permanent part of the appeal property's immediate visual context.
6. The extensions at the rear of this pair of semi-detached properties are somewhat discordant. The proposed development would broadly be in keeping with the size and design of No 18. In my judgement, the development would better unify the appearance of the rear elevation of the properties when viewed as a pair. Moreover, the proposed crown roof design of the extension would not be apparent in the available views from the surrounding gardens.
7. The proposed extension would not reflect the character of the wider area. It is therefore contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2015-2030) and the design principles of the Redbridge Housing Design SPD identified above. However, for the reasons set out above and in the specific context of the appeal site, I conclude that the proposed development would be acceptable and the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

8. A condition is necessary requiring the use of matching materials to preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I have included a condition identifying the approved drawings for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR