

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2017

by David Smith BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23rd January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3155731

29 Church Road, Ilford, Essex, IG2 7ET

- 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 Mrs Bedana Rahman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1554/16 was refused by notice dated 11 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval is granted under the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for a single storey rear extension at 29 Church Road, Ilford, Essex, IG2 7ET in accordance with the details submitted pursuant to Paragraph A.4(2) of the Order.

Reasons

2. The appeal property is a mid-terraced dwelling and has a rear projection of about 3m. It is proposed to erect a further full width single storey extension to an overall depth of 6m. In considering 'larger home extensions' there is a requirement to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises. Account should be taken of any representations made but Paragraph A.4(9) establishes that the amenity of all adjoining premises should be considered and not just those which are the subject of representations. As the prior approval process has been triggered I shall therefore have regard to the effect on the adjoining properties at 27 and 31 Church Road.
3. Following prior approval from the Council an extension of about 6m has been constructed at No 27. As the proposal would be directly alongside it there would be no adverse effect on that neighbouring house.
4. On the other side there is an addition at No 31 which matches that existing at the appeal property. The ground floor windows closest to the boundary are full length with grilles and would appear to serve a living space. Because of the north-facing aspect there would be no loss of sunlight but the proposal would bring about an increased sense of enclosure with some loss of outlook. However, as the proposal would extend about 3m beyond the back of No 31 these consequences would be within tolerable limits. This is supported by the other extensions nearby and their relationship to one another including that approved at No 27. This has a similar effect on the appeal dwelling as the

proposal would have on No 31. As such, the impact on amenity would be acceptable and the size of the extension is not excessive.

5. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and approval granted.
6. The appellant should, however, note that the Order requires at Paragraphs A.4(13), (14) and (15) that the development must be completed on or before 30 May 2019 and that the developer must notify the local planning authority of the completion of the development as soon as reasonably practical after completion. Such notification must include the name of the developer, the address of the development and the date of completion.

David Smith

INSPECTOR