



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2024

by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PG CERT (Arch Con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/24/3346143
805 and 807 Eastern Avenue, Ilford IG2 7RY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by MR Arbab Sikandar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 0538/24.
 - The development proposed is two storey and part single storey rear extension for 807 Eastern Avenue. First floor rear infill extension for 805 Eastern Avenue.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During my site visit I observed that No 807 Eastern Avenue has been extended with a hip to gable roof extension and a rear facing box dormer. Neither are included on the existing or proposed plans. Likewise, a single storey rear extension has been added to No 807 but to a greater depth than that proposed as part of the appeal scheme.
3. I also saw that the fenestration pattern on the rear dormer, first and ground floor rear extensions of No 805 Eastern Avenue do not correlate to those shown on the existing or proposed plans. The pitch and height of the roof above the first-floor rear extension to No 805 also appears to be different to that depicted. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the plans submitted and that were before the Council at the time of its decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in relation to this appeal is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwellings and the wider area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a pair of 2-storey semi-detached dwellings. No 805 forms a corner plot at the junction of Eastern Avenue and Leyswood Drive. It lies on the periphery of a residential area, with commercial properties on the opposite side of the Eastern Avenue dual carriageway (A12).
6. Surrounding houses are formed by repeated house types that share consistent architectural detailing such as hipped roofs, double height curved bay windows

and unvarying building lines. Despite some alterations and extensions over time they retain a degree of uniformity.

7. Both dwellings have an uncomplicated appearance to the front elevations with the asymmetrical double height bay windows the only notable features. No 805 has had a previous two-storey side extension, as well as a rear ground floor and partial first-floor extension above. They appear as obviously subordinate extensions such that the form of the original dwelling can be readily understood. Both dwellings contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The Council has directed me to its Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2019 which states that in the case of 2-storey rear extensions, the first-floor element should generally be no more than half the width of the original rear elevation to ensure it is proportionate and subordinate to the host property and minimises impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours¹. It goes on to suggest that the roof of the extension should match the roof design of the original house and that the Council may refuse bulky extensions on corner plots where they would fail to be subordinate to the host property and present a large blank flank wall to the side street.
9. It is proposed to extend No 807 with a 2-storey rear extension and No 805 with a first-floor extension above an existing single storey addition. This would result in first-floor extensions that would extend across the full width of both properties, replacing the smaller first-floor addition to No 805.
10. Given the position of the dwellings on what is effectively a corner plot, the first-floor element of the proposed extensions would be publicly visible from within Leyswood Drive, above the boundary wall. This would particularly be the case in respect of the first-floor extension to No 805, which would be visible for some distance south along Leyswood Drive, due to the set back of nearby dwellings. Despite having a relatively limited projection, the proposed extensions would nonetheless obscure the original rear elevations in their entirety, such that they would not appear subordinate to the host dwellings in these public views. The Council suggests that there are no other full width first floor rear extensions in the area and this chimes with my observations during my visit.
11. I note that the planning application form suggests that the proposed extensions would be finished in render. However, the existing additions have been completed in brick which may suggest an alternative finish. If the proposed extensions were to be constructed from similar materials, this would accentuate their dominating effect. They would also not appear similar to nearby houses which have predominantly rendered finishes.
12. The existing flat roof dormer window fails to respect the proportions or form of the original roof to No 805. Nevertheless, it is in itself a structure of a simple form. In contrast, due to the width of the proposed extensions and the need to avoid interference with the box dormer behind, the resultant roofscape would be numerous conjoining hipped roofs. This would present a very complicated roof form, contrary to the prevalent simplicity of nearby hipped roofs². For

¹ Paragraph 3.3.2 of the Council's SPD.

² As shown on the proposed roof plan drawing number ZAAVIA/EA/112.

these reasons, the proposed development would fail to be subordinate to and fail to respect the simple architectural appearance of the host dwellings.

13. The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwellings and the wider area. It would fail to comply with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018). These policies seek amongst other things, to support development that is subordinate to the existing building in terms of size, scale or height and incorporates a roof profile and materials sympathetic to the existing dwelling. These objectives are shared by the SPD. The proposal would also fail to comply with Policy D3 of the London Plan which seeks to ensure that new development positively responds to the existing character of a place through scale, appearance and shape.

Other Matters

14. The proposal would utilise urban land and provide additional living space for the future occupants. However, there is no suggestion in the evidence before me that the proposal would increase the density of development at the appeal site through the provision of additional dwellings. There may be other ways to add additional space to the dwellings without causing the harm identified. The lack of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers is to be expected in new development and weighs neither for, nor against, the proposal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR