
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2016

by Richard Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3151648

Land rear of 16 Wellesley Road, Ilford, Redbridge IG1 4JX

- 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 Mazhar Mahmood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0670/16, dated 17 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as '*erection of new dwelling house on land rear of 16 Wellesley Road IG1 4JX*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Revised plans have been submitted as part of this appeal that would, in my view, materially alter the proposal. Given the substance of the Council's concerns and the nature of the amendments, the plans would need to be the subject of further assessment and consultation, but as this has not taken place I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the original plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future occupiers and the occupiers of Nos. 16 and 18 Wellesley Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace residential property on the junction of Wellesley Road and Morland Road close to Ilford town centre and within a predominantly residential street. The proposal would be located at the rear of the existing garden area and accessed from Morland Road. Whilst a single storey commercial building is located to the rear of the appeal site, it was evident from my visit that the rear residential gardens were free from significant development.
-

5. Despite the appearance of the dwelling being reflective of surrounding dwellings, the introduction of a two storey building in this location would be in noticeable contrast to the pattern of development within the area. When combined with the proximity to its boundaries, its relatively narrow width and constrained plot size it would result in the introduction of a prominent building that would appear cramped on the site and unduly dominant in the streetscene. In particular, the side elevation would be a large expanse of brickwork with little visual relief when viewed on the approach down Morland Road from the junction with Wellesley Road. In my view, the proposal would be an incongruous addition that would be at serious odds with the character and appearance of the area. In its context it would not represent a high quality of design.
6. For these reasons, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy BD1 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 ('DPD') and Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy 2008 ('CS'). Amongst other things these require all development to be compatible with and contribute to the character and amenity of the area, contribute to local distinctiveness and be of a massing, scale and design appropriate to the locality.

Living conditions

7. The proposal would be sited very close to its rear boundary, formed by the existing side boundary to No. 18 and constructed from wooden fence panels. The only outlook from the kitchen/diner area would be onto this fence and when combined with limited opportunity for any landscaping and the lack of any additional openings to serve this room, it would create a sense of enclosure that would be oppressive and overbearing to future occupiers, harming their outlook.
8. The proposal would also result in a two storey elevation close to the rear elevations of Nos. 16 and 18 Wellesley Road. Whilst the outlook from No. 18 would not be materially harmed, due to the siting of that property, the outlook from the ground and first floor of No. 16 would be of a blank, two storey brick wall with little visual relief. Sited in such proximity to the rear of No. 16, it would be overbearing and visually intrusive.
9. For these reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of future occupiers and the occupiers of No. 16 Wellesley Road in terms of outlook and would conflict with Policy SP3 of the CS and Policy BD1 of the DMD. Amongst other things and taken as a whole, these policies require the living conditions and amenities of surrounding occupiers to be protected.

Other Matters

10. I do not doubt the appellant's intentions to build to Life Time Homes standards and to use high quality insulation and construction materials. Furthermore, I acknowledge the proposal would result in the creation of an additional dwelling in an area of generally high housing demand. However, these factors do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the area and living conditions of existing and future occupiers.

11. The Council's third reason for refusal refers to the fact that the proposal fails to show how it would affect a nearby protected tree. Because I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds it is not necessary for me to consider this matter further. The Council also refer to Policy 3.5 of the London Plan in the second reason for refusal but I have not been provided with a copy and have not therefore considered it any further.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and having considered all other matters raised, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, when read as a whole and I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard Aston

INSPECTOR