

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2016

by Graham M Garnham BA BPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 01 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3158091

25 Mordon Road, Seven Kings, Ilford, IG3 8QR

- 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 Asad Chaudhary against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 3012/16, dated 22 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is 6 metre rear extension & outbuilding & front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application form says that the development for which planning permission is sought was completed in February 2016. The retrospective nature of the proposal does not affect my consideration of its planning merits.
3. The appellant says he sent amended drawings to the Council. I have not seen these, and have assessed his proposal using the drawings listed by the Council on its decision notice.

Main Issues

4. I consider that these are the effects of the proposal on firstly, the character and appearance of the host property and the locality; and secondly, the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers at no.23, by virtue of loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure.

Reasons

5. The Council does not object to the outbuilding. I consider that it is in scale and character with those to either side, and see no reason to take a different view on its merits. I focus my attention on the parts of the proposal in dispute, namely the front porch and the rear extension.
-

First main issue – effect on character and appearance

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow of modest proportions. In common with others in the locality, the original design is characterised by two front bay windows. One is rectangular, the other has angled sides and projects slightly less: both have similar gable features above. The front door is between them. The design and spacing of the bay window features give a distinctive appearance to the front elevation, and create a regular rhythm in the street scene.
7. Several of the bungalows have been extended or altered. This includes a hip-to-gable roof conversion at the appeal site. The attached bungalow has a flat-roofed porch linking the two bay windows. The appeal proposal is for a discrete porch, in line with the larger, rectangular bay, but only separated from it by a narrow gap. The gap to the angled bay is clearer. A new gable feature has been added above the porch. This links physically to those either side, sharing a common gutter with each. As a result, the three bays form a single structure, albeit that the gable over the angled bay is set slightly back from the others. The eye is further drawn to this anomalous feature by the contrast in colour between it (white) and the dark brown framework of the windows and door below. Elsewhere, I observed that the predominantly white colour of the window frames tones far better with the pale colour of the gable features. Consequently I find that the porch and its bay roof are an incongruous and intrusive addition that detracts from the original form and design of the bungalow, and is out of keeping with its neighbours.
8. At the rear, the extension projects 6 metres and has a lean to roof that rises to a height of about 4 metres where it abuts an existing full width box dormer window. The Council accepts the majority of the rear extension as it could be erected as permitted development. I see no reason to take a different view. However, the extension also projects beyond the main side wall of the property, up to the boundary with no.23. This section is of mono-pitch form and extends uneasily beyond the box dormer. Seen from the front, it forms a vertical side extension that is over half the height of the host building. I consider that this element of the rear extension detracts materially from the form and appearance of the host building, notwithstanding the considerable amount of enlargement that has already taken place or would be permitted development.
9. I conclude that the proposal detracts significantly from the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. This brings it into conflict with Policies BD1 & BD5 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies (2008) and Strategic Policy 3 in the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy (2008). Among other things, these policies seek to secure a high quality of built environment in which new development is compatible with the distinctive character and appearance of the locality and complementary to the host building.

Second main issue – effect on living conditions

10. The concern arises from that part of the rear extension that is close to the common boundary with no.23 next door. I consider that the outer part of the extension can be seen readily from a nearby back window at no.23. However,

the impact is mitigated by two matters. Firstly, the height of the extension reduces further from the window; and the view of it would be impeded in part by an outbuilding near it in the neighbour's back garden. However, I consider that the upper part of the side of the extension, which rises to 4 metres and then drops vertically, would appear both incongruous and somewhat overwhelming from the rear garden, from where its height would be seen to be well above the eaves height of the neighbour's bungalow.

11. I conclude that additional harm would arise from impact of the rear extension on the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers at no.23, by virtue of loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure. This would prejudice the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to Policy BD1.

Overall conclusion

12. I have found against the proposal with respect to both main issues. I consider that the harm I have identified could not be overcome by the standard planning conditions that have been suggested.
13. Consequently planning permission should be withheld and I dismiss the appeal.

G Garnham

INSPECTOR