
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2016

by Gareth W Thomas BSc(Hons), MSc(Dist), PgDip, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 01 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3155531

2 Naseby Road, Clayhill, Ilford, Redbridge IG5 0NW

- 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 & Mrs Erma Bellot against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3391/15, dated 11 August 2015, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of existing garage and erection of 3-bedroom house adjacent No.2 Naseby Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the area and on the future occupiers of the property in terms of outlook and accommodation provision.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site forms part of the side and rear garden of the host dwelling which is a semi-detached two storey house located on a corner plot at the junction of Naseby Road and Wensleydale Avenue. The property is set at an angle as it presents itself to the junction. A small triangular area of open space lies immediately to the front of the existing house thus giving it a significant setback from this road. Consequently, together with the hedgerow boundary treatment to the frontage of the property, the area around the junction has an open and attractive appearance that makes a valuable contribution to the spacious quality of the area. This is by contrast to the rather hard urban edges of properties along the road that are by and large devoted to vehicular hardstanding.
 4. Siting a new two storey house between the flank wall of No 2 and the pavement would significantly erode the spaciousness of the street scene on this prominent corner plot. Moreover, the house would be substantially forward of the line of properties along Naseby Road on this side of the road thus adding to the incongruous position of the appeal scheme. The overall design of the house would be similar to others in the area, including the host property. However these positive aspects and this background do not persuade me from
-

finding that the siting of the new house would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.

5. Consequently there would be conflict with Redbridge Core Strategy Policy SP3 that requires developments to sit comfortably with existing adjacent buildings and in their locality and with Policy BD1 of the Council's Borough Wide Primary Policy in terms of scale, massing and density. There would also be conflicts with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically the need for developments to create high quality environments that respond positively to local character.

Living conditions

6. The rear elevation of the proposal would be within approximately 7m of the side boundary of the neighbouring property at its very widest but reducing significantly the closer the proposed house is to Naseby Road. The outlook from rear facing windows would be of the flank wall to No.4 Naseby Road and of the hardstanding in front of the property. This would offer a poor relationship between the dwellings and be oppressive for future occupiers. In addition, the useable private outdoor space would consist of a small area to the rear coupled with a side garden to the front immediately behind the pavement edge. This would be overlooked to a significant degree and would provide limited and consequently unsuitable outdoor private space for families. This would be contrary to the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Amenity Space and Residential Development (SPG) at Table 5.1.
7. Accordingly, although acknowledging the appellant's arguments that the development would exceed the minimum sizes as set out in The London Plan and would fulfil one of Government's ambitions to boost significantly the supply of housing, the proposal would be contrary to Redbridge Core Strategy (CS) Strategic Policy (SP)3 which seeks to ensure that the Borough's built environment is of a high quality that serves the long-term needs of its residents.

Conclusions

8. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, this appeal is dismissed.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR