



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2024

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3336660

48 Lexden Drive, Chadwell Heath, Redbridge, Romford RM6 4TJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Russel Ludhi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 2949/23.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "2nd Floor Addition. (Fast Track)".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (as amended) for 2nd floor addition at 48 Lexden Drive, Chadwell Heath, Redbridge, Romford RM6 4TJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2949/23 made on 5 October 2023, and the details submitted with it, pursuant to Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in the middle of a small terrace of dwellings. The adjoining end property of 46 Lexden Drive has been extended upwards to create a 3 storey dwelling, and the appeal proposal would respect the height and roof design of No 46. The window design and placement of the appeal proposal would also respect that of the host dwelling.
4. I also saw that an upwards extension to 44 Lexden Drive has been constructed on the neighbouring terrace.
5. The Council submits that the proposed extension would be a bulky and unsympathetic addition that would not be subservient to the existing building. However, it is inevitable that permitted development rights to add an additional storey will have some impact on the appearance of the host building. Mindful of that, the resultant 3-storey dwelling would not appear as unacceptably overdominant or obtrusive compared to the original building and the extension to No 46. The design and architectural features of the elevation fronting the

- highway of the resultant dwellinghouse would reflect the character and appearance of the host building and the suburban setting.
6. The proposal would alter the ratio of 2 and 3-storey dwellings within this short terrace. The wider area is also characterised by 2-storey dwellings. However, given that the principle of 3 storey dwellings in this terrace and in the immediate area has been established by extensions at Nos 44 and 46, then the appeal proposal would not be unduly obtrusive or would unacceptably unbalance the proportions of the terrace compared to the existing situation.
 7. Consequently, I find that the effect on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse would be acceptable and that the proposal would accord with the requirements of paragraphs AA.2(2) and AA.2(3)(a)(ii) of Class AA.
 8. No further matters of dispute have been raised by the parties in respect of the remaining qualifying criteria under Class AA, including the amenity of any adjoining premises. Based on what I have observed and read I see no reason to disagree.
 9. Given the above, the development would therefore accord with the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the GPDO. I am satisfied that the proposal would not conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of achieving well-designed and beautiful places.
 10. Standard conditions are set out in paragraph AA.2 of Class AA, which would address the conditions indicated on the Council's Questionnaire. In granting approval, I have removed reference to 'Fast Track' as this is not an act of development.
 11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR