

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3168273

10 Sandyhill Road, Ilford, IG1 2ET.

- 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 B Gohill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref: 5204/16, dated 31 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is conservatory to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the implications of the proposal for (1) the character and appearance of the area and (2) the living conditions of occupiers of No 8 Sandyhill Road in terms of the potential for intrusive effects and loss of outlook.

Reasons

3. Whilst proportions of the proposed conservatory are relatively modest in isolation, in conjunction with the existing rear extension, it would project out from the rear of the dwelling a considerable distance. However, there are a range of extensions and additions to nearby properties and whilst I saw none identical to the appeal proposal, it would not be so markedly different as to appear out of place. As a single storey structure, it would retain a very much subservient relationship with the host dwelling and would not appear out of proportion thereto.
 4. I thus find in relation to the first main issue, that the proposal would integrate satisfactorily with the host dwelling and wider character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) (CS), or Policies BD1 and BD5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (2008), which seek to ensure that new development is of high quality, which respects the character of the host building and amenity of the locality.
-

5. In relation to the second main issue, the proposed conservatory would be slightly lower in height than the existing rear extension to the appeal dwelling. However, it would project considerably higher than the common boundary fence between the appeal property and No 8 Sandyhill Road. Because of this and its combined rearwards projection with the existing extension, it would appear over dominant and intrusive relative to that property, rendering the garden in particular, less pleasant to use. It would also appear unduly intrusive in the outlook from that property, most particularly again from the garden area, but to a lesser extent from within the house itself. This would bring the proposal into conflict with criterion (f) of Policy SP3 of the CS, requiring all new development to respect the amenity of adjoining properties.
6. I understand there were no objections to the proposal from the occupants of No 8. Given its poor condition at the time of my visit, it may well be empty. Either way, the proposal would be likely to endure for many years and I must also have regard to the longer term living conditions of its occupiers.
7. Although I have found in favour of the appeal in relation to the first main issue, this is nonetheless outweighed by my concerns about the impact of the proposal on occupiers of No 8 Sandyhill Road. The appeal therefore fails.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR