



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3353720

64 Stoneleigh Road, Ilford IG5 0JE

- 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 Kamal Uddin Ahmed against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 1081/24.
 - The development proposed is a front porch and canopy and alteration of roof over the side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the front porch and canopy.
2. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted insofar as it relates to the alteration of the roof over the side extension at 64 Stoneleigh Road, Ilford IG5 0JE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1081/24 and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Preliminary Matters

4. The development has been undertaken and therefore, this is a retrospective proposal, and I have considered it on that basis.
5. Planning permission was granted for a '*Front porch. Part single storey side extension, First floor side extension*' in 2022 (Council reference 2724/22). This application seeks consent for elements which were not built in accordance with the approved plans. The Council have no objection to the alterations to the roof of the side extension, and from the information before me and my observations, I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, my considerations focus on the porch and canopy as the matter in dispute.

Reasons

6. No.64 is a semi-detached property with a projecting two-storey bay to the front. The area comprises rows of properties of a similar form with many have been altered and extended. The scale and design of the porch additions vary although these are primarily modest additions to the entrance.

7. The erected porch is not significantly larger than that already approved, but rather than having a mono-pitched roof, it has a gabled form which sits just below the first-floor window. The general form and proportions of the porch reflect the projections to the front of the property, and there are other properties with gabled porches, including that of the immediate neighbour No.62. However, projecting from the porch is a canopy which extends across the full width of the property. This projection and its detailing, including the deep flat roof and decorative columns, significantly change the appearance of the property, both screening and horizontally dissecting the architectural bay window feature and creating a dominating addition to the frontage.
8. As I observed, there are examples in the area of other front canopy additions, and the use of white columns is a design aesthetic utilised in alterations to other properties in the surrounding area. The extent to which these elements harmonise with the existing property varies, and the Council advise that some of the more extensive additions along Stoneleigh Road were erected without the benefit of planning permission. While through the passage of time, these have become part of the area, I do not find that they are so prevalent to have changed the prevailing character.
9. I accept that property requirements and styles change, and there will be benefits to occupiers through the adaptations. It was nonetheless clear from the presence of the various additions to properties in the area that a range of alterations are facilitated and there is no evidence to suggest there is a specific need for the canopy.
10. Policy LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (Local Plan) supports householder developments which complement the character of the building, in terms of scale, style, form and materials. The front of the house is a prominent feature in the street scene, and specifically in relation to porch additions, the Council's Housing Design Supplement Planning Document (SPD) advises that they should be sympathetic, and where there is a bay, they must not extend beyond the depth.
11. The appearance of the appeal property has already been altered with the addition of extensions and the use of grey render and fenestration. The further combination of the scale and design of the additions to the front elevation creates an incongruous and unsympathetic feature which detracts from the character of the original property and adversely impacts the street scene.
12. Therefore, in conclusion, I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the area and is contrary to Local Plan policies LP26 and LP30, and the SPD. Together, these seek high-quality design which respects the local character of the area and makes a positive architectural and urban design contribution to its context and location.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out, the appeal is dismissed with regard to the front porch and canopy. However, as the alterations to the roof are acceptable and these two elements are severable, I have split the decision. The work to the roof is already in place, and therefore no further conditions are needed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR