

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2017

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3163955

1A Ingatestone Road, London, E12 5HE

- 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 & Mrs Sparkes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2525/16, dated 31 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a rear and side extension, part single part double storey.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear and side extension, part single part double storey, at 1A Ingatestone Road, London, E12 5HE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2525/16, dated 31 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL490-1 & PL490-2A.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on, firstly, the character and appearance of the Aldersbrook Conservation Area and, secondly, the living conditions of existing occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The Aldersbrook Conservation Area is characterised primarily by Victorian and Edwardian terraced and semi-detached housing. The appeal property is a modern infill house within the Conservation Area, I understand dating from around 10 years ago. It has been designed to have a front elevation of traditional design that closely matches the appearance and the scale of the houses to the north, but then to the rear the house quickly drops in height to effectively be single storey with a large roof area that partly contains living
-

accommodation. This more contemporary element of the house extends westwards and is clearly visible from the road.

4. The proposed extension would see a further projection of this contemporary element, westwards into the garden area. The design is simple, infilling an existing underused side return, with the existing roof line and southern side elevation extended. Whilst the new extension would be visible from the road, as noted above this elevation is already seen in public views and there would only be marginal change to the visual presence of the building. The longer elevation would, due to the lower height and subdued appearance, still appear proportionate to the overall scale of the house. I also consider that the rear contemporary part of the house would appear subordinate to the taller, more traditional element of the building that fronts Ingatestone Road.
5. Under s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I have a duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Aldersbrook Conservation Area. It is my conclusion on the first issue that the appearance of the extended house would still appear appropriately balanced and in scale, with no undue imposition upon the Conservation Area. Thus the character and appearance would be preserved. This would be consistent with Policies E3 and BD1 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (BWPP) (2008) and Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy (2008), the general thrust of which is to seek a high quality of design in all new development, including residential extensions, that complement the character of the building, and conserve the historic environment. Thus, no harm would be caused to the heritage asset.

Living conditions

6. The Council's second reason for refusal was on the basis that the extension would lead to an unacceptable reduction in amenity space for existing occupiers, based on standards contained in Policy BD4 of the BWPP.
7. The appellants' Statement clarified that this was a misunderstanding based on an error of the site plan provided at the application stage: the appellants demonstrated to me that they own more garden land than originally shown, and at my site visit I saw the additional area of land is indeed part of the garden to No. 1A. When having regard to the true garden area for the appeal property, the appellants' figures demonstrate there is no longer a shortfall in amenity provision when measured against Policy BD4. The Council do not dispute the appellants' corrected evidence.
8. I have also had regard to the situation as I saw on site, and it was clear to me that an extension to the property as proposed would leave a large, useable area of amenity space that would be perfectly sufficient for the needs of any existing or future occupier of the house.
9. It is therefore concluded on the second issue that the proposed development would not be harmful to the living conditions of existing occupiers, and there would be no conflict with Policy BD4.

Other considerations and conclusion

10. The positioning of the extension is distant enough from adjoining houses, including those to the south, to ensure no undue overbearing impact from the proposals. The design and scale of the proposed extension would not give rise to any harmful effect on levels of light or overlooking.
11. For the reasons given the appeal is therefore allowed. I have attached the Council's suggested conditions requiring matching materials, to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, and a further condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR