
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by David Hogger BA MSc MRTPI MCIHT

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

Decision date: 19th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3159306
106 Castlevew Gardens, Ilford IG1 3QE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Suleman Daria against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3352/16, dated 13 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received. I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbours at 104, Castlevew Gardens, particularly in terms of outlook and increased sense of enclosure.
4. The host dwelling sits in a terrace of residential properties and the proposed development would provide a rear extension of about 4.00m in both depth and height. I saw that the adjoining dwelling, number 104, has not been extended (unlike many others in Castlevew Gardens) and the submitted plan (Doc#003) confirms that at the rear of the aforementioned neighbouring dwelling are a kitchen and living room which both have windows overlooking the back garden.
5. The proximity, height and depth of the proposed extension in relation to No 104 would result in an over-bearing and visually intrusive development that would harm the living conditions of those neighbours. I agree with the appellant that because the rear of the properties face north, the loss of light to the neighbouring dwellings caused by the proposed extension would not be

significant. However, this does not outweigh my findings with regard to outlook and sense of enclosure in relation to No 104.

6. I have not received an objection to the proposal from the occupiers of No 104 but if permitted, the extension would be likely to be long-standing and would be detrimental to any future occupiers of No 104 (as well as the existing occupiers).
7. For the above reasons the appeal should be dismissed.

David Hogger

Inspector