



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2025

by **E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3372772

4 Ely Gardens, Cranbrook, Ilford IG1 3NQ

- 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 Rafiq Islam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 1399/25.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as “proposed ground and first floor side extension and first floor rear extension. Will be built of cavity wall with facing bricks to match existing. With hip roof. The front elevation porch will be extended. This proposal will allow for a study room and a family room to the ground floor, first floor will allow for ensuite to front and rear”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground and first floor side extension and first floor rear extension at 4 Ely Gardens, Cranbrook, Ilford IG1 3NQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1399/25, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos OSM/3589 Proposed Roof Plan, OSM/456 Existing First Floor, OSM/4560 Proposed Ground Floor, OSM/4561RP Proposed First Floor, OSM/4562RP Proposed Rear Elevation, OSM/4563 Proposed Front Elevation, OSM/4567 Existing Ground Floor, OSM/458 Existing Rear Elevation, OSM/459 Existing Front Elevation, OSM/604RP Proposed Westside Elevation, OSM/606 Existing Roof Plan, OSM/673 Existing Eastside Elevation, OSM/674 Existing Westside Elevation, OSM/675RP Proposed Eastside and Site Plan and Location Plan.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises ground and first floor side extension and first floor rear extension. This description reflects that provided by the appellant on the appeal form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area. Properties within the surrounding area share a broadly consistent architectural style. Nevertheless, a number of properties, including those immediately adjacent to the appeal property, have been altered and extended, including through side and rear extensions.
5. The Council raises concerns about the scale of the proposed first floor rear extension, in particular the width and depth of the extension. These comments are made with reference to the guide width and depth set out in the Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). However, the SPD is not before me. In any event, the SPD has the status of guidance and not policy.
6. From the plans before me and my observations on site, it is evident that the proposed rear extension would appear subservient to the existing property. Consequently, it would complement, rather than dominating, the existing built form.
7. I acknowledge that the proposed rear extension would be visible from Peterborough Gardens. Nevertheless, the street scene already includes a rear first floor extension at 6 Ely Gardens. The proposed extension is of a similar design to the extension at No 6 and also reflects the design of the host dwelling. In this context, the proposed extension would not appear incongruous. The use of materials to match the existing property would ensure that the proposed extension is not overly prominent within the street scene.
8. The Council does not object to the proposed side extension in character and appearance terms. From the evidence before me and my observations on site, I have no reason to disagree. The extension would assimilate to an acceptable standard with the surrounding area.
9. Taking account of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal complies with the relevant provisions of Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030. These policies, among other matters, seek development which respects the local character of the area, complements the character of the building and maintains or improves the appearance of the locality or street scene.

Conditions

10. To meet legislative requirements, I have imposed a condition to address the period for commencement. A condition requiring compliance with the submitted plans is also necessary for reasons of certainty. A further condition requiring the materials to match those of the existing building is necessary, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

E Everitt

INSPECTOR