

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2016

by H Cassini BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 08 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3152860
15 Purley Close, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0TP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Uddin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1237/16 dated 21 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and rear extensions at 15 Purley Close, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0TP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1237/16, dated 21 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 4988/1 (Existing Layout), 4988/2 Rev A (Proposed Two Storey Side and Rear Extensions), 4988/3 Rev A (Elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Two planning applications were submitted and subsequently refused for similar schemes at the appeal site. A point of confusion has arisen regarding which decision this appeal relates to due to the dates entered on the appellant's appeal form. The date of the application entered relates to the first application scheme and the date of the LPA's decision notice relates to the second application scheme. Clarification was sought from the appellant and confirmation was received that the appeal relates to the second application scheme^[1].

^[1] Council reference 1237/16

3. I note the Council's misgivings regarding which application is the subject of the appeal. However, under the householder appeal process the Council's written appeal evidence is confined to the planning officer's report relating to the application. As I have received copies of reports relating to both planning applications I am therefore fully aware of the Council's comments relating to both applications and as such, I am able to determine the appeal on the basis of the second application. As I have all the relevant documentation before me I do not consider that any injustice has occurred as a result of me taking this course of action in order to progress consideration of the submitted appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue are the effects of the proposal on;
- (i) the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - (ii) the living conditions of the occupants of 16 Purley Close, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is a 1930's two storey semi-detached dwelling, located in a prominent position at the head of a cul-de-sac. Sited within a residential area of reasonably close knit streets, the area is characterised by a mix architectural styles. Most dwellings are located within relatively substantial plots, having modest front driveways and well-proportioned rear gardens. It was evident from my site visit that a number of surrounding dwellings have been altered and extended to both the rear and sides, including the neighbouring dwelling at 16 Purley Close.
6. Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Local Development Framework Core Strategy – Development Plan Document 2008 (the CS) and Policies BD1 and BD5 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies – Development Plan Document 2008 (the DPD) seek, amongst other things, to ensure that proposals for new development are of a high quality design, respect the local urban environment and have regard to residential amenity. Additional guidance is also contained in the London Borough of Redbridge Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (the SPD) which, amongst other things, requires extensions to be appropriate to the existing dwelling and its context.
7. The proposed two storey side extension would largely be constructed on the footprint of the existing garage and outbuildings. I note that the side extension would project further forward than the existing garage and associated structures. However, the proposal would be set back by 1 metre from the front elevation and the ridge line would remain lower than the main dwelling.
8. In this instance, I consider that the proposed use of sympathetic materials coupled with the setback design would be sufficient to ensure that there is clear visual separation between the appeal dwelling and the adjacent property at No 13. At the same time, the scale of the proposal would maintain definition to the main dwelling, expressing the proposed extension as a subordinate addition.

9. Additionally, guidance within the SPD states that semi-detached housing is generally designed to be symmetrical. As No 16 has previously undergone a similar side extension, I further find that the proposal would result in a visually balanced appearance at the head of the cul-de-sac.
10. Turning my attention to the proposed rear extension, I note the Council's concern regarding the proposed scale. It is however evident from the information before me that the appellant has significantly reduced the width of the proposal. Furthermore, the proposed ridge height would remain below that of the ridge of the main dwelling.
11. Taking into account the proposed design, use of sympathetic materials and the reduced scale, I consider that the rear extension would not appear as an overly dominant or alien feature in terms of either the host dwelling or the wider prevailing pattern of development within the immediate locality.
12. Accordingly, the appeal proposal would respect the character and quality of the locality. Thereby, the design objectives of Policy SP3 of the CS, Policies BD1 and BD5 of the DPD and guidance within the SPD would remain uncompromised.

Living conditions

13. Concern has been raised by the Council that the first floor extension would result in an adverse effect on the outlook of the neighbouring occupiers of No 16 from their rear garden. I accept that aspects of the uppermost first floor extension may be evident when viewed from the rear garden of No 16.
14. Nevertheless, the existing vegetation and height of the close boarded wooden fence which marks the rear side boundary between these properties would soften the visual impact of the new form. As such, I do not consider that the presence of the extension would represent a harmful, overbearing feature or have a significant enclosing effect on the outlook from the rear garden of No 16.
15. Taking the above matters into consideration, I find no conflict with the overall amenity aims of Policy SP3 of the CS, Policies BD1 and BD5 of the DPD and guidance within the SPD.

Conditions

16. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests of the National Planning Policy Framework and advice provided by the Planning Practice Guidance. I find them to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case.
17. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in order to provide certainty. A condition relating to materials is appropriate in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion

18. I note the Council's concerns with regards to the first application scheme. However, I consider that the appellant has satisfactorily acknowledged these issues and sought to address them in the revised scheme. As such, I consider

the proposal to be a suitable form of development. I therefore conclude that, subject to appropriate conditions, the appeal should be allowed.

Helen Cassini
INSPECTOR