



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2024

by A Hartley, LLB(Hons), Solicitor, MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3339625

18 Peel Place, Clayhall, Redbridge, Ilford IG5 0PS

- 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 & Mrs Parmar against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref is 2867/23.
 - The development proposed is for the conversion of garage into habitable room, first floor side extension. Alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Issue

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated since the parties' appeal submissions have been made. However, as the revisions do not affect the matters under consideration in this appeal (other than different paragraph numbering), it was not considered necessary to seek further comment.
3. The description of development differs from that on the planning application form. I have used the description used by the Local Planning Authority as it more clearly reflects the development proposed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is situated within a residential street characterised by dwellings of differing design, comprising both semi-detached and detached properties. The appeal site is at a curve in the road and is directly opposite the entrance to a cul-de-sac spur along Peel Place. The property has an existing single storey garage attached to the side elevation angled away from the main dwelling in line with the curve to the road frontage. The garage has a pitched roof, matching that of the host dwelling. The frontage width of the garage is approximately 7.20 metres, and the main dwelling is approximately 9.10 metres.

6. Although the existing garage exceeds the dimensions required in the London Borough of Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD) in terms of width that would apply to side extensions, the design appears subordinate at single storey, set back from the frontage of the host dwelling and angled away from it, in line with the curve in the road. The existing dwelling is therefore proportionate in its design, and in its appearance in the street-scene.
7. The appeal proposal would introduce a second storey to the garage the width of which would exceed that set out in the SPD
8. Due to the prominent position of the appeal site at the head of the Peel Place cul-de-sac spur, and at the curve in the road (Peel Place), the appeal proposal would be highly visible in the street scene. Due to the width of the extension, it would not appear as a proportionate or subordinate addition to the host dwelling. Instead, it would have the appearance of a separate dwelling within the street scene.
9. Overall, for the above reasons, I find that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, being an unacceptable addition in terms of scale and massing that would appear incongruous in the street scene.
10. Accordingly, I find that the proposal conflicts with policy LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (LP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), all of which seek high quality design that respects local character and makes a positive contribution to its context and location. It would also fail to comply with the SPD, which has similar aims.

Planning Balance

11. The appeal proposal would provide benefits by increasing the available living space for the occupiers. However, I do not consider this outweighs the identified harm caused by the proposal.

Conclusion

12. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and with the provisions of the Framework. There are no material considerations that would justify a decision other than one in accordance with the development plan. The appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR