

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2017

by S M Holden BSc MSc CEng MICE TPP FCIHT MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3172173

1 Southwood Gardens, Barkingside, Ilford IG2 6YF

- 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 R Royju against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0392/16, dated 28 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as a “retrospective application for single storey 4.5m rear extension”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the extension on the:
 - a) character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area;
 - b) living conditions of the occupants of No 3 in relation to outlook and enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 1 Southwood Gardens is a detached bungalow set in a corner plot at the junction with Kenwood Gardens. The surrounding area is characterised by two-storey terraced dwellings typical of the inter-war period. The extension has already been built, but photographic evidence of a previous rear extension was presented with the appeal.
 4. As a consequence of its location on a corner plot, the rear of No 1 is visible from the surrounding street scene. The new extension occupies the full width of the property. This brings built development closer to the street and breaches the building line along Kenwood Gardens. The extension has a large flat roof which dominates the rear elevation of the building. Its height projects above the eaves partially obscuring the original roof of this modest bungalow and resulting in the total loss of the eaves along the rear elevation. Furthermore, it has a large, white barge board that not only surrounds the extension but also projects beyond the back of the dwelling. This adds to the bulk of the roof and increases its prominence within the street scene.
 5. The height and depth of the extension therefore has a clumsy appearance and appears out of proportion with the host dwelling. In particular the roof fails to integrate satisfactorily with the existing bungalow, resulting in the extension as a
-

whole appearing awkward and dominating the rear of the dwelling. I consider the loss of the eaves is especially harmful to the overall appearance of the bungalow.

6. Furthermore, the size and scale of the extension, with its large expanse of flat roof, is highly visible above the boundary wall along Kenwood Gardens. From here it appears both alien and out of character with the immediately surrounding dwellings. Whilst other properties may have rear extensions, none are prominent within the street scene. The appeal scheme is therefore not comparable with other extensions in the vicinity of the site.
7. I therefore conclude that the extension is harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy (Core Strategy) and Policies BD1 and BD5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (Primary Policies DPD). These policies, amongst other things, seek high quality design that respects its setting. Although not cited in the Council's decision notice Policy BD5 is also relevant as it requires extensions to complement rather than dominate the existing building and incorporate a sympathetic roof profile.

Living conditions

8. The extension projects some 4.5m into the rear garden and is set in over 1m from the shared boundary with No 3. This adjacent house has an extension that wraps around the side and rear of the dwelling and a small garden which narrows towards its rear boundary.
9. I understand that the pre-existing extension was just over 3m deep, with an eaves height of 3.25m and a maximum height of 3.5m. The current scheme is 4.5m deep and has a uniform height of just over 3.5m. The additional depth of the extension can be seen from the rear of No 3. However, given the separation distance between the two dwellings, I am not persuaded that it has resulted in materially harmful loss of outlook from the rear of this adjacent house. As the height of the extension is similar to that which was previously on the site, I am also satisfied that it does not appear overbearing or give rise to a significantly increased sense of enclosure.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the extension is not harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of No 3, arising from unacceptable loss of outlook or increased sense of enclosure. In this respect the proposal does not conflict with Policy SP3 of the Core Strategy or Policy BD1 of the Primary Policies DPD, both of which seek to respect the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Conclusion

11. Notwithstanding my conclusion in relation to the effects of the extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 3, I have found that it is harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
12. For this reason, and having regard to all other relevant matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sheila Holden

INSPECTOR