



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: 28TH January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/24/3347225

17 and 19 Beattyville Gardens, Ilford IG6 1JN

- 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 Sajid Mehmood against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 0026/24.
 - The development proposed is for first floor rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for first floor rear extensions at 17 and 19 Beattyville Gardens, Ilford IG6 1JN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 0026/24, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans 2335/ PL01, 2335/PL 02, 2335/PL03. 2335/PL04, 2335/PL05, 2335/SO1, 2335/SO2, 2335/SO3, 2335/ SO4. 2335/ SO5 and 2335/S06.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The semi-detached pair of properties each have single-storey additions to the rear. The form of the proposed extension, which is to be replicated on each property, would create four, two-storey, hipped roof elements across the rear of the building.
4. While the depth of the proposed extension is very slightly above the 3m maximum limit for rear extensions outlined in the Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD) it would align with the existing ground floor extension to No. 19 and would not extend as far as the single-storey elements at No. 17. Additionally, to be constructed using matching materials, the rear elevation would have a cohesive appearance.

5. I observed individual two-storey projections of a similar form to neighbouring properties from the rear garden of the appeal properties, but otherwise these and the proposed extension would not be seen in views from the street. It was also evident that the rear of many of the properties in the area have been altered with a variety of additions and there is also some variation in the house types along Beattyville Gardens.
6. The scale of the development would not reflect the guidance in the SPD in relation to the width of rear extensions, although, as noted in the SPD, this is general guidance, and the aim is to ensure proportionality, subservience and to minimise the impact on the adjoining neighbours. The proposal would create a large addition, but there is unity to the design, and through the set down and form, there would be a subservience in height and a limited massing at roof level. As such, I do not find that it would be overly bulky or disproportionate to the building as a whole.
7. The Council has drawn attention to an appeal decision relating to a property in Merlin Grove, although as it was for a side extension which was found to be incongruous and not preserve the street scene, I do not find it to be directly comparable. The design of the proposed rear extension respects the host property and, due to its siting, would have no visual impact on the street scene.
8. I do, however, agree with the Council that the main issue in the appeal decision referenced by the appellant related to the neighbour's amenity. Nonetheless, there is a clear reference to the extension being more than half the width of the rear elevation, which, in that case, the Council had not found objectionable. Moreover, this highlights where appropriate the provisions within the SPD can be applied with some flexibility and that each case is to be considered on its own merits.
9. Overall, I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the appearance of the host property or the character of the area and thereby accords with policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) and the SPD as a whole. Together these promote high-quality design, respect for the existing building and for development to integrate well with the surrounding area.

Conclusion

10. I, therefore, conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions to ensure compliance with the statutory requirements relating to the commencement of development and the plans in order to provide certainty. I have also in the interest of the appearance of the building, imposed a condition requiring the materials to match.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR