

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by R Barrett BSc (Hons) MSc Dip UD Dip Hist Cons MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 5th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3155221

27 Woodside Road, Woodford Green IG8 0TW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Amit and Deepa Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application was dated 26 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'double side extension, double rear extension, new roof design with dormer, change of front'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the locality and on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 25 Woodside Road, with regard to outlook, daylight and privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site includes a two storey house. It has a single storey garage to one side. Although properties in the street vary in type, design, style and materials employed, there is some cohesion in terms of their size, layout in relation to the street and their relationship with one another. Although many have been extended and altered over time, some with large extensions, they generally have gaps between them, often above a garage or single storey element, which gives the locality a generally spacious feel.
 4. The appeal extensions would considerably increase the size of the host dwelling such that it would appear out of scale with other properties in the street. It would appear as three storeys, particularly from the rear, which would be out of place in this locality of mainly two storey dwellings. The extensions proposed would be large in relation to the host dwelling, would dominate it and significantly alter its appearance. The roof in particular would have considerably greater bulk than the existing. The resultant property would take up almost the full width of the appeal site. It would close the gap between the appeal site and No.29, which would diminish the gaps between properties that I have identified. All in all, for these reasons, it would fail to preserve the
-

generally spacious character and appearance of the locality that I have identified.

5. In coming to this conclusion, I have had regard to development at No. 29 brought to my attention, which I was able to assess on my site visit. That property appears larger than other dwellings in the street and I have limited information on the circumstances that led to it. In any event, it does not provide the justification for the unacceptable development before me.
6. I conclude that the appeal proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the locality and would fail to accord with London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (2008) (BWPP) Policy BD5. That policy aims for extensions to existing dwellings to complement the character of the building, particularly in terms of scale, style, form and materials. In particular, it aims that they do not dominate the existing building.

Living Conditions

7. The proposed side and rear extensions would be closer to the boundary with the adjacent property 25 Woodside Road, than the existing dwelling. However, there would be some separation distance and existing boundary features, including a fence and hedge, would reduce their impact on views from that property. That property sits at a slightly higher level than the appeal site and the windows nearest are to non-habitable rooms on both ground and first floor. All in all, whilst the proposed dwelling would be more dominant in views from that property, including its rear garden, for the reasons stated it would not be harmfully oppressive or significantly reduce the daylight received into it. Furthermore, due to the orientation of the proposal in relation to No. 25, no significant effect on the sunlight received into that property would be a consequence.
8. The proposed rear dormer would be large and would afford views into the garden of No.25. However, similar views are afforded from the first floor windows of the appeal site. Bearing this in mind, overlooking into the private areas of that garden would not be significantly altered. That garden is large, and on balance, no harmful loss of privacy would be a result.
9. I conclude that the appeal proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at 25 Woodside Road, with regard to daylight, outlook or privacy. For this reason, it would generally accord with BWPP Policy BD1, which states that all development must not prejudice the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

10. I appreciate the efforts made to address the Council's concerns expressed in its pre-application advice. However, I have found that the proposed development would still be harmful to the character and appearance of the locality.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed and planning permission refused.

R M Barrett INSPECTOR