

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 06 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3165519

4B Heybridge Drive, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1PE

- 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 Siraj Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4375/16, dated 14 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear/2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear/2 storey side extension, at 4B Heybridge Drive, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1PE, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 4375/16, dated 14 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing numbers and 2016.039.PA.01, 2016.039.PA.02, 2016.039.PA.03, 2016.039.PA.04, 2016.039.PA.05, 2016.039.PA.06, 2016.039.PA.07, 2016.039.PA.08, 2016.039.PA.09, 2016.039.PA.10, 2016.039.PA.11, 2016.039.PA.12, 2016.039.PA.13, 2016.039.PA.14, 2016.039.PA.15, 2016.039.PA.16, 2016.039.PA.17, 2016.039.PA.18, 2016.039.PA.19, 2016.039.PA.20 and 2016.039.PA.21.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No. 4B is a semi-detached house located within a predominantly residential area characterised by semi-detached and terraced 2-storey houses and bungalows. It adjoins No. 4A beyond which is a pair of semi-detached bungalows. To the south of the appeal site is a school while to the east are
-

playing fields. There are mature trees to the southern boundary and part of the eastern boundary. Proposed is the demolition of an existing detached garage and rear conservatory and their replacement with a single storey rear extension and a 2 storey side extension.

4. I note that the Council did not raise concerns in respect of the proposal harming the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings and did not take issue with the design of the proposed rear extension. As the proposal would not overlook, overshadow or appear oppressive in the outlook from any neighbouring dwelling and the proposed rear extension would not be readily seen from any public thoroughfare, I have no reason to disagree in respect of either of these matters.
5. The Council is concerned however, that the width, roof design and lack of set back from the front wall of the existing dwelling house would make the proposed side extension an intrusive addition that would be out of scale and character with the host and surrounding dwellings, and would harm the character and appearance of the area.
6. I observed that the appeal site stands on a sharp bend in the road. This means that the site does not align with the road but is set at an angle to it with the road curving away. As such the side of the appeal site is not prominently situated in relation to Heybridge Drive but rather is angled away from it. The proposed side extension would stand parallel to the side boundary of the appeal site, leaving a gap of around 1m. This would give it a "wedge" shape such that it would be wider at the back than the front. It would be set back from the front of the existing house by around 500mm and would step down in height, having a lower ridge line than the host building. The proposed materials would match the existing dwelling.
7. The position on the bend in the road and the wedge shape would give the proposal a receding effect when viewed from Heybridge Drive. Consequently, it would not be visually dominant but rather would politely integrate itself in terms of scale, proportion and finishes with the host building in particular and the street-scene in general. The existing mature planting along the site boundary would soften its profile from the adjoining school and parkland.
8. Accordingly, in my judgement, the site specific circumstances in this case are such that the proposal would not harmfully change the character and appearance of the area and would not conflict with Policy SP3 of the adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policies BD1 & BD5 of the adopted Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document.
9. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the tests and advice within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I agree that conditions are necessary in respect of commencement time, relating the development to the submitted plans and materials in the interests of providing certainty and protecting visual amenity.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Richard McCoy

Inspector