



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: 17 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3358581

101 Kirkland Avenue, Ilford IG5 0TN

- 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. M Pradhan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 3094/24.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side/rear extension at 101 Kirkland Avenue, Ilford IG5 0TN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 3094/24, 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 numbers ID: CM-00634138; 7124/51 A – Revision A and 7124/52 A – Revision A.
 - 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. A two-storey rear extension had been erected. This is not shown on the submitted plans but appears to be in relation to a previous approval (Council Reference 2381/24). For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the plans before me. The Council do not object to the first-floor side extension, and I find no reason to disagree with their conclusions. My recommendation therefore focusses on the first-floor rear element and, specifically, its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a pitched roof, a rear dormer and single storey front, side and rear extensions. The character of the

surrounding area is residential and predominantly comprises semi-detached two storey properties, with some bungalows. Kirkland Avenue includes dwellings in a variety of mostly traditional styles, where the majority have been notably extended and altered to the side and rear. These include Numbers 97 and 99 Kirkland Avenue, which both have two storey side and rear additions. Gaps between side elevations along the street scene are therefore sporadic.

5. The width of the proposed first floor rear extension would be more than half the width of the existing property and would not comply with Section 3.3 of the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2019. However, the SPD provides guidance, and the proposal would comply with the maximum depth of three metres and the 45-degree rule. Moreover, it would not appear excessive or out of scale with the developments of the area. It would have a similar width to the two storey rear additions at Nos 97 and 99. It would also not project beyond the rear elevation of No 99 and would be set away from the side boundary with No 103. The proposal would therefore appear proportionate and subservient to the host dwelling. Its ridge height would be set lower than the main roof and its eaves would be in line with the existing. It would also not be visible from public vantage points, due to its siting to the rear and the proposed first floor side extension. Whilst the extension would be positioned close to the side boundary, this would correspond with the sporadic gaps of the street scene.
6. The proposed first floor rear extension would not thus cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would not conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018, the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these 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.

Other Matters

7. The matter of the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbours, notwithstanding the Council's reason for refusal, was not a contentious matter in the appeal. Given the close proximity of the appeal building to its immediate neighbours, even in the absence of the proposals, I do not disagree with the Council's findings in this regard.

Conditions

8. 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

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. As such, I recommend the appeal is allowed and planning permission granted subject to the conditions above.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR