

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2016

**by Graham M Garnham BA BPhil MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 03 January 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3163053**

**105 Perrymans Farm Road, Barkingside, Ilford, IG2 7LU**

- 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 Mrs Hastings against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
  - The application Ref 3863/16, dated 11 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2016.
  - The development proposed is first floor rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. I consider that these are the effects of the proposal on firstly, the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings; and secondly, the living conditions of the occupiers of no.107 Perrymans Farm Road with respect to harm to outlook.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is towards the centre of a short terrace of two storey houses with original, paired rear projections. That at the appeal site abuts the projection at no.107. The submitted drawings highlight in blue a ground floor extension that has previously been approved by the Council (ref 1698/16, approved on 29 June 2016). Both the drawings and the description of the proposal make it clear that it is only a first floor addition to this scheme that I am being asked to consider. I shall confine my attention to the merits of the first floor extension, and take the approved scheme as a "given".
  4. The approved scheme would fill the gap between the rear projection and no.103, and extend out about 2.5 metres further to the full width of the site. The proposed rear extension would add 1.57 metres to the first floor end of the original projection, which would reach to within about a metre of the end of the ground floor extension.
-

***First main issue – effect on character and appearance***

5. The proposal would extend outwards the roof slope and outer side wall of the existing projection. It would have a vertical wall towards no.107, which would rise over 2.5 metres above the ground floor extension to the ridge line of the projection. This would give a “saw tooth” effect to the new end of the projection. I consider that this shape would appear as an incongruous addition to the even rhythm of three paired rear projections of identical form and proportions. The relationship would be seen clearly from the local street scene, looking across intervening rear gardens from the nearby side road.
6. The appellant has submitted information about two approved schemes in support of her proposal. Neither appears to be closely similar to the appeal site – one appears to be an end-of-terrace property, the other semi-detached – and it is not clear if either could be seen from the public domain. In the absence of further background detail, I am not persuaded that either scheme is of direct relevance to the merits of the appeal proposal.
7. I acknowledge that the proposal is of relatively modest scale, and could match the existing in terms of materials, detailing and windows. However, given the visibility of the extension in the locality and its uncharacteristic shape, I consider that it would not secure the high quality in the built environment now expected by development plan policy. It would also fail to be compatible with the distinctive character of its surroundings, and it would not complement the character of the existing building in terms of style and form. In these ways it would conflict with Policy SP3 in the Redbridge Core Strategy (2008) and with Policies BD1 & BD5 in the Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (2008).
8. The Council cites its *Householder Design Guide* Supplementary Planning Document [SPD] (2012) in its reason for refusal, but makes no specific references to its contents. I am not aware that it has provisions that relate directly to the form of the appeal proposal.
9. I conclude that the proposal would detract significantly from the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings, contrary to the development plan policies listed in paragraph 7 above.

***Second main issue – effect on living conditions***

10. There is a bedroom window in the end wall of the projection at no.107. The appellant’s drawing shows that the proposal would not intrude into a “45 degree line” from the centre of this window, as illustrated in the SPD. I consider that it would not impinge significantly on the outlook from this window. There is a short ground floor extension at the rear of no.107. I consider that the proposed first floor extension would have less effect on outlook from the nearest window in it than the approved ground floor extension, while the window in any event appears to be to a bath room.
11. I conclude that the proposal would not detract materially from the living conditions of the occupiers of no.107 Perryman’s Farm Road with respect to harm to outlook. There would be no conflict with the development plan policies cited above which, among other things, seek to ensure that all new

development respects the amenity of adjoining properties and that the amenity of adjoining occupiers is not prejudiced.

***Overall conclusion***

12. The proposal would not materially prejudice the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. Nonetheless, I consider that this would not outweigh the significant harm to character and appearance arising from the shape and visibility of the rear extension.
13. I conclude overall and on balance that planning permission should be withheld, and I dismiss the appeal.

*G Garnham*

INSPECTOR