



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3358805

47 Wensleydale Avenue, Clayhall, Ilford, Redbridge IG5 0NA

- 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. Amar Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 2403/24.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of double storey rear and side extension, formation of porch and roof extension to include dormer in rear roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as the erection of double storey rear and side extension, formation of porch and roof extension to include dormer in rear roof slope at 47 Wensleydale Avenue, Clayhall, Ilford, Redbridge IG5 0NA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2403/24, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, drawing reference PP-13367588v1; FV-2024-03; FV-2024-01-A – Revision A and FV-2024-02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The above description is taken from the application form. Other documents refer to more detail, including a front porch, two storey side extension, single and part first floor rear extensions, a loft conversion with a rear dormer, hip to gable roof alterations, three front roof lights and alterations to the fenestration. I have also taken this detail into account in my findings.
4. Drawing no. FV-2024-01-A – Revision A was amended during the life of the planning application. The Council's decision was based on it, I have therefore taken it into account in my recommendation. A single storey front, side and rear extension

was under construction at the time of my site visit but had not yet been completed. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the plans referred to above.

5. The Council raised no concern regarding the proposed two storey side extension, front porch, hip to gable roof conversion or rear dormer. I find no reason to disagree with their conclusions thereon. My recommendation therefore focusses on the two storey rear element. The main issue in regard to which is its effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal building is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, set within a rectangular plot. It comprises one of four prominent corner plots at the crossroad junction where Wensleydale Avenue meets Marston Road. Due to the setback of dwellings and the wide road and pavements, this contributes to the openness of this junction and of Wensleydale Avenue.
7. This is less discernible from Marston Road. The built forms of Numbers 42 and 44 Wensleydale Avenue are situated up to the edge of the pavements. Their positioning, together with the defined side boundary treatments of the appeal site and Number 49 Wensleydale Avenue, results in a sense of enclosure at the junction heads of Marston Road. Beyond the appeal building to the rear, the street scene still retains an open feel thanks to the long, narrow rear gardens.
8. The proposal would result in an increased depth and overall massing to the existing building, which will create a blank flank wall to the side street. This would be clearly visible from public vantage points. However, it would appear as a subordinate structure. This is due to the proposed lower ridge height, a first floor set back from the front elevation and a flat roof. The proposed extensions are also differentiated through the varied roof types from pitched to flat. This allows for a visual break in the massing of the development. Moreover, given the long, narrow shape of the rear garden and the distance from other dwellings, its overall form would not appear overly dominant to the street scene. Whilst the proposal will contribute to the enclosure of Marston Road at the junction head, this would not detract from the character of the area. This is due to the defined boundary and building lines along this street scene. The use of matching materials would also respect the design and appearance of the original dwelling.
9. For these reasons, the proposed two storey rear extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would not conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (2018), the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure developments are of high-quality design, which respects and complements the character, scale, form and materials of the existing building and of the area.

Conditions

10. To provide certainty and for enforcement purposes, it is necessary to impose the standard time limit and specify the approved plans. A condition is also necessary for materials to match those used on the existing building to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed given it would comply with the development plan and there is nothing compelling to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the stated conditions.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

INTERESTED PARTIES: