



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3370678

62 Stoneleigh Road, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0JE

- 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 Dr Adam Razack against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref is 1136/25.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The porch canopy was substantially complete at the time of my site visit. It is therefore retrospective in nature, and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 62 Stoneleigh Road is an extended link-semi-detached two storey house that has been altered and extended over time. A porch was constructed some time ago; however, the open canopy was built more recently. There are a number of rather grand porches within the locality, although 64 Stoneleigh Road adjoining does not have the benefit of planning permission with an appeal dismissed fairly recently by one of my colleagues for its as-built design. Going by the Council's Officer report, other large porches appear to have been in situ for quite a substantial amount of time, and overall are in the minority.
5. The Council's Housing Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) stipulates that the front of a house is a prominent feature of the street scene and therefore any alterations should be proportionate in scale and sympathetic in character, to minimise its visual impact. Where a bay window exists, a porch must not extend beyond the depth of the bay (paragraph 3.7.2).
6. The Council's Officer report stipulates that the open porch extends beyond the depth of the bay window by 0.7m and this has not been disputed by the appellant. The most noticeable aspect of the proposal is its elevated position which renders the canopy as overly tall in appearance supported by 2no spindly piers. I

acknowledge that the dimensions of the porch, against which the canopy has been constructed, has been in situ for many years and therefore is itself lawful.

Nonetheless, the canopy, whilst open, still creates a three-dimensional form which is at odds with the prevailing pattern of development within the locality, I say this notwithstanding that I accept that it was constructed in order to protect the appellant and his family from rain when entering the property.

7. I consider it to be an incongruous feature that detracts from the character of the host property and the wider street scene. Whilst I acknowledge that the appellant tried on numerous occasions to contact the Local Planning Authority to no avail, discussions will be necessary for the way forward, there may be some design solution that is deemed acceptable to the Council, but it is not for me to speculate on this.
8. Therefore, having regard to the other examples cited by the appellant and from my own site visit, I conclude that the proposal has a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (March 2018) which seek to promote high quality design in all development within the Borough and that development of poor design, that does not take available opportunities to improve an area's character and quality will be refused planning permission, this is in addition to specific policy on household extensions which requires development to complement the character of the building, particularly in terms of scale, style, form and materials.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR