



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3368727

32 Avondale Crescent, Ilford, Redbridge, IG4 5JB

- 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 Marin Enache against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 0553/25.
 - The development proposed is a first storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling which has been extended to the rear at ground floor level. The property is set back from the road behind a parking area and has a garden to the rear.
4. The appeal property is located in a predominantly residential area, largely characterised by the presence of two storey semi-detached dwellings. Dwellings tend to be set back from the road behind short parking areas and have relatively long gardens to the rear.
5. During my site visit, I observed that a number of dwellings have been extended to the side, such that pairs of semi-detached dwellings appear extremely close to adjacent pairs of semi-detached dwellings. Indeed, it was apparent during my site visit that the majority of dwellings in the area have been altered and/or extended over time and consequently, there are examples of changes to the front, rear and sides of dwellings, as well as of development at ground, first floor and roof levels.
6. Many of these changes appear in character with their host dwellings, as well as with the surrounding area and the overall effect is that of a high density residential environment characterised by ongoing development that largely respects its surroundings.
7. The proposed development would comprise a large, flat-roofed first floor addition to the rear of the appeal dwelling. As a result of its width, projection and prominent

first floor location, I consider that the proposal is of such a scale that it would appear to dominate the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling.

8. In particular, the width of the proposal, which would extend across almost three-quarters of the width of the dwelling at first-storey height, would appear disproportionate in scale to the host dwelling and would fail to appear as a subordinate addition.
9. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed flat roof appearing to visually jar with the pitched roof of the host dwelling. Further, the proposal would appear as an incongruous large flat-roofed first storey extension in its wider surroundings. Whilst I noted the presence of a wide range of additions to the rear of neighbouring dwellings during my site visit, none of these appeared directly comparable to the proposal before me in terms of scale and overall design.
10. Having regard to all of the above, I find that the proposed development would appear as an intrusive, disproportionate, insubordinate addition, out of keeping with the host dwelling and its surroundings, drawing undue attention to itself from the garden setting behind the appeal dwelling.
11. Taking all of this into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR