

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2017

by Clive Tokley MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3171603

3 Malford Grove, South Woodford, London E18 2DX

- 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 N Yusaf against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 5530/16 dated 20 November 2016 was refused by notice dated 25 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 3 Malford Grove, South Woodford, London E18 2DX. The permission is in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 5530/16 dated 20 November 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: JND/0777/10, JND/0777/11, JND/0777/12, JND/0777/13 Rev A, JND/0777/14 Rev A, JND/0777/15 Rev A, and JND/0777/16 Rev A.
 - 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 Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of dwellings to the south as regards outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The end of the rear garden of the appeal property is outside but close to the western boundary of the Snaresbrook Conservation Area (CA). The principal defining characteristics of the CA are Eagle Pond and the Eagle Public House to the south and the distinctive dwellings fronting the linear green of The Drive.
-

The proposed extension would be separated from the CA by the length of the garden of No 3 and the intervening presence of the outbuilding. The proposal would have no effect on the setting of the CA or its significance as a heritage asset.

4. The appeal dwelling has been extended at the rear and has rooms in the roof. The proposed extension would add to the overall size of the dwelling at ground floor level but the house would retain a good-sized garden. The design of the extension would reflect that of the outbuilding and the house. The Council indicates concern about the cumulative effect of the proposal in conjunction with the outbuilding. However whilst the gap between the house and the outbuilding would be reduced to 3.4m (Officer report) there would remain a clear distinction between the buildings.
5. The proposal would be seen from the gardens and rear windows of the three houses to the south; however being at the rear of the house it would be seen only the narrowest of glimpses from Malford Grove and between The Oaks and The Limes in Hermitage Walk. Malford Grove is fronted by a variety of house types including some that extend back at some depth from the front of the site. I consider that the proposal would not appear out of place and would not detract from the character or appearance of the house or the surrounding area.

Living conditions

6. The three recently-built houses to the south back onto the side boundary of the appeal property which is marked by a close boarded fence with trellis above. The westernmost house (No 1 Malford Grove) backs on to the full-height flank wall of No 3. The proposal would be seen in oblique views from the rear of No 1 but would have no material effect on the outlook at the rear of that property.
7. The rear boundary of The Oaks is partly alongside the two-storey rear addition of No 1 with its single-storey lean-to at the side and rear. The remainder backs onto the gap between the house and the pitched-roof outbuilding. That outbuilding extends across almost the whole of the rear boundary of The Limes.
8. The extension would be more directly in view from The Oaks and The Limes. It would narrow the undeveloped space between the house and the outbuilding and would limit the view of distant trees from the rear of The Oaks. The eaves of the building would be above the top of the fence and trellis with the roof plane sloping away above. The height and appearance of the proposal would be comparable with the outbuilding; however it would be further from the boundary than the existing lean-to rear extension and would have a shallower pitched roof.
9. The proposal would change the outlook from the rear windows and gardens of The Oaks and The Limes but there would not be an unrelieved outlook of wall and roof and taking account of its height and off-set from the boundary the extension would not be an unacceptably over-dominant building.

Other matters

10. The occupiers of The Oaks and The Limes have expressed concern about loss of light; however being to the north of those properties, and taking account of the existing buildings, the proposal would not materially affect daylight or sunlight

reaching The Oaks or The Limes. Concern is expressed about the effect of the proposal on property values but I can give no weight to this in reaching my decision.

Conclusion

11. Taking account of all matters I conclude that the proposal would not detract from the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the area and would not be unacceptably harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of dwellings to the south as regards outlook. The proposal would not conflict with Policies BD1 or BD5 of the *Borough Wide Primary Policies DPD* 2008 or Strategic Policy 3 of the *Core Strategy* 2008.
12. I have imposed the normal conditions governing the commencement of development and identifying the approved drawings. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance I have imposed a condition requiring that the external materials should match those of the existing building.

Clive Tokley

INSPECTOR