



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2017

by A Napier BA(Hons) MRTPI MIEMA CEnv

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

Decision date: 30 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3178703

2 Sunnymede Drive, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1JU

- 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 Nainesh Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0873/17, dated 25 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed double and single storey side extension with change of use from garage to habitable room'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed double and single storey side extension with change of use from garage to habitable room at 2 Sunnymede Drive, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1JU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 0873/17, dated 25 February 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site location plan, block plan, and existing and proposed floor plans and elevations Ref 1183.
 - 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 Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a predominantly residential area. With some exceptions, the local pattern of development is generally characterised by short rows of terrace houses, set back from the highway and incorporating two-storey bay window gable projections to their front elevations. There is a strong uniformity in the design of the dwellings, which provides a clear rhythm to the streetscene. Whilst the appeal dwelling also has a similar projection, it forms one half of a pair of semi-detached two-storey dwellings and is situated at the junction of Sunnymede Drive and Kenwood Gardens.

4. The appeal site is broadly triangular in shape and the dwelling has previously been extended to the side by a garage, which follows the side boundary of the site. As a result, although the structure appears as a double garage from the front, it tapers significantly and is substantially narrower to the rear. The appeal proposal seeks to convert and extend the garage, effectively creating a two-storey side extension, with a modest single-storey extension to the rear.
5. From the front, the width of the proposed extension would be significant. However, at first floor level, its front elevation would be set back from that of the main dwelling, with a small area of pitched roof above the deeper ground floor element. The ridge height of the extension would also be notably lower than the existing and the proposal would use matching external materials. I consider that this articulated form and the design details proposed would significantly reduce its visual impact and perceived scale and mass.
6. Whilst the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling is not readily visible from the public domain, views of it are possible from a number of neighbouring dwellings and their rear gardens. The rear elevation of the proposed extension would be relatively narrow and, for reasons similar to those above, I am satisfied that its effect on the appearance of the appeal dwelling would be acceptable, including in respect of the single-storey element.
7. Except for a relatively narrow pathway, the proposed extension would extend across almost the whole width of the site. It would also materially reduce the separation at first floor level between the appeal dwelling and the neighbouring house at No 59 Kenwood Gardens. However, due to the corner location and configuration of the site, a distinct gap would remain between the two properties, which would provide a clear visual and physical separation between the appeal dwelling and its neighbour. The extension would also be set back some distance from the highway and a garden area would remain to the rear of the site. As such, whilst sizeable, the proposal would not be excessive, or result in an inappropriate overdevelopment of the site.
8. In addition, No 59 currently includes a two-storey projection to the side, which appears similar to the appeal extension in its scale, form, appearance and overall design. Within this context and for the reasons given, I am satisfied that the proposal would represent a sympathetic and visually subservient extension to the main dwelling and a complementary addition to the streetscene. It would not be visually incongruous and would not appear out of scale or character with the existing dwelling or surrounding development.
9. Consequently, I conclude overall that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the area. It would accord with the *London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy 2008* Policy SP3 and the *Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008* Policies BD1 and BD5, where they collectively seek to protect local character and appearance. It would also meet the aims of paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework, to achieve high quality design and take account of the different roles and character of different areas.

Other matters

10. Concerns have been expressed at the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at No 59, particularly in respect of privacy, outlook and light. The appeal proposal would inevitably result in some

change to the existing situation for these neighbouring occupiers. However, having regard to the details proposed, the siting, layout and relative orientation of the dwellings and their gardens, and the relationship of the properties to each other, including the existing and proposed fenestration arrangements, I consider that the impact of the appeal scheme in these respects would be limited and would not be unacceptably harmful. As such, this issue does not represent a reason to find against the proposal.

11. In addition, concerns have also been raised that the rear door proposed to serve the ground floor extension may result in the proposal being used as a separate dwelling. However, there is nothing within the appeal submissions to indicate that the appellant intends to use the building in this way. In any event, this is not a matter primarily before me as part of this appeal, but is an issue for the local planning authority in the first instance. As such, it is not a matter that leads me to alter my findings above.

Conditions and conclusion

12. The Council has suggested a condition requiring the use of matching external materials for the extension which, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, is necessary. In addition, for certainty, it is necessary that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
13. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Napier

INSPECTOR