



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2025

by **C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3349827

281B Mortlake Road, Ilford, Redbridge IG1 2TF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Rubina Ansari against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 1660/24.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension with a depth of 6.00 metres, highest point of 3.52 metres and height at the eaves of 3.00 metres.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development constitutes permitted development.

Reasons

3. The proposed development is a small single storey rear extension. However, the Council's officer report and decision notice refer to a side and rear wrap-around extension with a width greater than half the width of the original dwelling house. The Council has subsequently clarified that this reason for refusal is erroneous.
4. Nevertheless, I have been provided with the decision notice for the original planning application which enabled the construction of No. 281B Mortlake Road¹. Various conditions were imposed as part of the permission, including one which removed permitted development rights from the property. As such, any proposals to extend the dwelling must be put forward through a planning application. There is no evidence before me to suggest that this condition has been removed and it can therefore be considered to be extant.
5. Given the circumstances around this appeal, and in the interests of fairness, I have provided the appellant with an opportunity to comment on this matter. No response has been forthcoming.
6. As a result it is clear that, irrespective of the nature of the proposed extension, it cannot be considered to be permitted development.

¹ Council ref: 3020/02, approved in April 2003.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR