

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2017

**by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 16 February 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3163044**

**23 Broadwalk, South Woodford, London E18 2DL**

- 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 Hasan Aktas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref 4205/16, dated 17 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2016.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a ground floor rear extension and a 2 storey side extension and a 1<sup>st</sup> floor rear extension, rooflights and a garage and a porch front extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. It is considered that the main issues are the effects of the proposed development on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

## Reasons

### *Character and Appearance*

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling situated within a predominantly residential area which includes similar types of dwellings some of which have been extended, including 21 and 25 Broadwalk. The proposed development includes extensions to the side and rear of the property. Cumulatively the scale of these proposed extensions would represent significant additions to the host property that would visually dominate the existing building rather than be either subordinate or subservient additions.
  4. There is already some evidence of terracing between extended properties along this side of Broadwalk. Elsewhere there are gaps between dwellings or pairs of semi-detached dwellings which are a characteristic of the streetscene. At first floor level, the proposed side extension would not be set back from either the shared boundary with No. 21 or the property's front elevation and the ridge would be only marginally lower than the existing roof. This element of the
-

appeal scheme would not appear a subordinate addition to the property. Further, although no resulting in terracing, the and siting, design and bulk, of the side extension at first floor level would erode the gap with No. 21 which adds to my concerns about the harm being caused to the streetscene.

5. From Greenhayes Drive there are views towards the rear of the property. The proposed rear extensions would be viewed against the context of the alterations to both Nos. 21 and 25. However, from these viewpoints the overall lack of subordination and visual dominance of the proposed development would be noticeable. The proposed rear extension would also appear to be of a contrived design to avoid the first floor extension conflicting with a 45° line drawn from the middle of the first floor bedroom window of No. 25. Further, the design concerns would be accentuated by the bulk of the proposed extension's roof.
6. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Strategic Policy 3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS) and Policies BD1 and BD5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (DPD). Amongst other matters these policies requires high quality development to be compatible with, and contribute to, the distinctive character and amenity of the area and for extensions to complement the character of the building and not to dominate the existing building. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design.

#### *Living Conditions*

7. By reason of siting and the existing 2-storey addition at No. 21, the proposed development would not adversely impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of this neighbouring property. I have noted the claim that a 6-metre single storey extension might be erected to the rear of No. 25 but no details confirming whether an approval has been given for this alteration have been provided. Accordingly, the assessment of the appeal scheme's effects on the occupiers of No. 25 is based upon the current circumstances.
8. The design of the proposed development takes into account a 45° line drawn from the middle of a bedroom window of No. 25 and the majority of the first floor element of the appeal scheme would be set back from the shared boundary. However, the length of the proposed rear single storey extension, which would be sited close to the shared boundary, would lead to an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No. 25 and a material reduction in outlook from the patio windows within the rear elevation. Further, there would be some potential for a reduction in levels of daylight reaching the patio window and patio area of No. 25.
9. Although there are some elements of the appeal scheme which could be acceptable this is a case where they are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the unacceptable harm which has been identified. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties and, as such, it would conflict with CS Strategic Policy 3 and DPD Policy BD1. Amongst

other matters these policies require all developments to respect the amenity of adjoining properties and not to prejudice the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. These policies are consistent with the Framework's core principle of a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. DPD Policy BD5 does not refer to living conditions matters and no specific conflict has been identified.

### **Conclusion**

10. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters including the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that this appeal should fail.

*D J Barnes*

INSPECTOR