

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2017

by Jameson Bridgwater PGDipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3165569
12 Crown Road, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1NE

- 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 Richard Rains (Secureland Developments Plc) against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3624/16, dated 28 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'construction of an end of terrace 3 bedroom family dwelling'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the future occupiers of the proposal and occupiers of the host dwelling and neighbouring properties, with particular regard to outlook, internal and external space.

Reasons

3. Crown Road is a residential street, with the appeal site being part of the curtilage of a two storey semi-detached house. The street contains a mixture of semi-detached and terraced houses.

Character and appearance

4. I have carefully considered the Council's representations in relation to the depth, design and appearance of the proposed new dwelling. Whilst, I accept that the proposal would have a greater depth than the host property, it would not appear incongruous when viewed from public vantage points; due to the design, separation and form being consistent with that of the host property and the street scene. Consequently, the proposed new dwelling would not materially harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area.
 5. Having come to the conclusions above, the proposal in relation to its character and appearance would be consistent with Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy DPD and Policy BD1 of the London Borough of
-

Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies DPD and Policies 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan which seek amongst other things to ensure that development would complement the character of the building, particularly in terms of scale, style, form and materials.

Living conditions

6. I accept based on the evidence before me that the proposal by reason of its modest rear ground and first floor projections would not result in a material loss of outlook for occupiers of the adjoining properties. However, the appellant's statement is clear that even taking account of the revised plan that clarifies the property as a 3 bedroom 4 person dwelling (452-16-10 RevA), there would still be a shortfall in relation to internal living space. Further, whilst I accept that the shortfall is small, it would result in a form of residential development that would be internally cramped and therefore materially harm the living conditions of future occupiers of the proposed dwelling.
7. I have carefully considered the appellant's representations in relation to the accessibility and regular shape of the gardens. However, the development would result in both the proposed and host dwelling having external space that would not be adequate to meet the needs of future occupiers given the identified public open space deficiency within the area. Furthermore, the proposed gardens would also be significantly smaller than other gardens in the vicinity of the appeal site. Consequently, the proposal would result in material harm to the living conditions of future occupiers of both the host dwelling and the proposed new dwelling.
8. Having come to the conclusions above, the proposal would conflict with Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy DPD and Policies BD1 and BD4 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies DPD and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan which seek amongst other things to ensure that development provides adequate internal and external amenity space. Such a conclusion is not altered by the proposed contribution of an additional dwelling to the local housing supply advanced by the appellant.

Conclusion

9. As explained above, in this case, the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area is a neutral factor. Further, with regard to the effect on outlook, this is a neutral factor. However, the proposal would not provide adequate internal and external living space that would result in material harm to the living conditions of future occupiers of both the proposed and host dwelling.
10. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jameson Bridgwater

INSPECTOR