
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3358751

6 Wallington Road, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 8QQ

- 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 Mamun Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 2437/24.
 - The development proposed is erection of first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached two storey dwelling, situated within a road of primarily semi-detached properties of the same style. A single storey side and rear extension was under construction at the time of my visit. The property has a subordinate height two storey rear gabled projection which, in common with the prevailing pattern of development in the area, extends across part of the width of the building at first floor level. The positioning and scale of these rear outriggers is such that they are not visible from the street scene, and this contributes to the overall sense of space between each pair of dwellings. The regularity of the outriggers as an original feature to the buildings along Wallington Road makes a positive contribution to the character of the area.
5. The extension would develop the first-floor space between the main rear elevation and the side elevation of the rear outrigger. By extending the existing rear projection across the full width of the dwelling, the proposal would detract from its subordinate existing appearance. Whilst the use of matching materials would help to assimilate the extension with the existing dwelling, this infilling, when taken together with its flat roof form and wide triple pane rear window, would be of an

incongruous design resulting in an adverse impact to the character and appearance of the host property.

6. Through adding to the building's mass at first floor level, the proposal would disrupt the balanced overall form of the pair of semi-detached dwellings. In addition, as viewed from the street scene, it would decrease the sense of space between the appeal site and adjacent No 4, thus eroding the existing sense of spaciousness. As a result, the extension would be an unsympathetic development which would harm the existing character of the area.
7. On this basis, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and area. In doing so, it would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030. These policies together set out requirements for new development to respect the local character of the area and for household extensions specifically to be of a subordinate size, scale or height to the building, to incorporate a sympathetic roof profile and to complement existing character in terms of scale and form. The extension would also conflict with the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document Guidance 2019, which advises that the roof design of first floor extensions should match that of the original house.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide increased bedroom space for the family. However, this private benefit would attract only very limited weight in support of the scheme. Reference has also been made to the use of energy efficient materials, albeit that no dependency has been placed between their use and the specific design and form of the development. The cumulative limited weight that these factors would attract does not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the dwelling and area.
9. The appellant has also drawn my attention to similar developments at Nos 10 and 12 Wallington Road. These extensions are however exceptions to the prevailing form and character of properties within the area, and their existence reaffirms my conclusion that the proposal would represent a harmful addition to the building. I also acknowledge the existence of other flat roof extensions in the wider area, some of which are visible from the appeal site's rear garden. These enlargements are however of a different nature to the proposal and again their presence does not justify the harmful development of the appeal site.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR