



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/25/3366879

96 & 96A Queenborough Gardens, Ilford IG2 6YB

- 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 Pellumb Mazreku against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application ref. is 0312/25.
 - The development proposed is Front porch. Rear veranda. First floor side infill extension. Front double bay windows. Front gable addition. Loft conversion with rear dormers. Two front roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the decision notice differs from that on the application form but is the same as that on the appeal form, which I have taken as agreement to the change. I have therefore used the description on the decision notice, amended to remove wording relating to the development being partially retrospective, which does not comprise development.
3. I saw on site that the drawings do not show two further front rooflights that have been installed over the central gable, which itself is set further back than shown. They show front gables of steeper pitch and narrower than built, and hipped roofs over the rear extension that are shallower and of lesser height than built. I cannot, therefore, treat the proposal as entirely retrospective.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a wedge-shaped plot containing an originally two-storey end terrace pre-war house, which has been extended to its side to create a further dwelling abutting its originally detached neighbour, and to its roof to create front and rear dormers to both resulting dwellings.
6. The street comprises mostly similar terraced houses, albeit a section of bungalows and semi-detached houses are opposite the site. Most retain original features, such as bay windows under decorative facing gables, but many also have rear dormers, altered porches or have been pebble dashed, rendered or painted. The street is

straight and fronted by similar-width plots, contributing to a strong sense of pattern and uniformity created by the recurring bays and gables.

7. Permission was previously granted to extend the terrace to create a further dwelling in the same style as the original at the end. This would have had a rectangular plan at first floor and eaves level, leaving a wedge-shaped gap to the side boundary. At ground floor level, a further flat-roofed side extension would have filled the gap and wrapped around to the rear of both resulting dwellings. As part of that permission, permitted development rights for further extensions were removed.
8. A further permission was subsequently granted on appeal for the retention of rear first floor extensions. I note that rear first floor extensions are shown annotated on the submitted drawings to the effect that they were permitted on appeal and I note also that the Council does not disagree in this regard.
9. The development fills the gap at first floor level between the side of the permitted extension and the side boundary, with an oblique hipped roof over. This closes the gap between the two terraces, except at roof level, where a valley over the side boundary meets the eaves of the neighbouring house.
10. The proposal would create two double height bay windows with facing gables over, one to each dwelling, with a monopitch porch containing a facing gable in between and in line with the front of the bays at ground level. A further facing gable above it at roof level would also be in line with the front of the bays and gables. Two rear dormers would sit above the two hipped roofs of the rear extension, that to the original house being wider, extending almost its whole width.
11. The Design and Access Statement states that materials would match existing properties. The rest of the terrace is half rendered with brickwork quoins and lower storeys, small clay tiles to the roof and divided windows, some of which are leaded and decorated. The drawings do not specify materials except to indicate hanging tiles to the rear dormers; but I saw on site that the building is rendered, with large format concrete tiles to the roof and undivided windows.
12. The effect of the development and parts of the proposal that differ from the building operations carried out at the front is to close the terrace gap, to create a roof form and a set of bays, windows and gables that are at odds with the prevailing pattern and style of houses on this side of the street and to introduce gable detailing and a type and pattern of windows and materials that do not combine elsewhere on the street, creating an incongruous appearance that harms character.
13. Whilst the form of the rear dormers alone is acceptable, in combination with the complex roof forms of the first floor extension below and in materials that do not match with the rest of the nearby roofscape, they too appear unduly incongruous. Despite the private nature of the rear gardens and the limited number of houses on the parallel street to the rear from which it could be seen, this would be sufficiently harmful to the character of the area as to be unacceptable.
14. Overall, the development and such parts of the proposal that differ from the building operations carried out, harm or would harm the character and appearance of the area. Conditions relating to materials could not adequately mitigate these harms. This would be contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (March 2018), which require development that respects local character in terms of form (including roof profile), style, materials and design.

Other Matters

15. Whilst I note the appellant's arguments in relation to whether the condition of the previous permission removing permitted development rights met the policy tests and in relation to the point at which the condition would take effect, that is not a matter before me in this appeal.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR