
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2017

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3179680

6 Cardigan Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9SY

- 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 Kambo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1813/17, dated 15 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single storey rear conservatory at 6 Cardigan Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9SY, in accordance with the terms of application ref: Ref 1813/17, dated 15 April 2017, and 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: 001, 002, 003, 004, 005 all as amended on 5 June 2017 and the site location plan.
 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 in this case are:
 1. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
 2. The effect of the development on the living conditions of the adjoining residents, having particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. 6 Cardigan Gardens is a two-storey end of terrace house, located in a well-established residential area. The property, which is constructed in brick and features a double height bay window and gable to the front, has undergone

- extensive alteration at the rear including a substantial single storey rear extension and a dormer window to the roof.
4. The surrounding area generally comprises properties of a similar age and style to the appeal property set out on clearly defined building lines with some modern infill development. Whilst there is a degree of consistency to the appearance of the older properties at the front, there is a variety of extensions at the rear. The immediately adjoining property No 4 has been extensively altered at the rear in a similar manner to No 6.
 5. Permission is sought for a conservatory addition to the single storey extension. The conservatory would be glazed to the front and to one side and would have a masonry wall to the common boundary with No 4. The structure, which would project 3m from the rear of the existing building, would be single storey in height with a flat roof.
 6. The conservatory, which would be simple in terms of its design and form, would have a lightweight appearance that would contrast with the robust character of the dwelling. Whilst it would add to the volume of the property it would be subservient to it in terms of its scale and appearance. Consequently, particularly in view of the extensive alterations that have already taken place, it would not have an overbearing impact on the character or appearance of the host dwelling.
 7. The proposed conservatory would not be visible from the front and would not therefore affect the street scene. Given its context at the rear, including the alterations to the neighbouring property, and its subservient scale and appearance, the proposal would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the wider area.
 8. I recognise that cumulatively the existing and proposed extensions are substantial. However, I am unconvinced, given the circumstances and context of this particular site, that the development would create an undesirable precedent. Moreover, it is my duty to consider the proposal on its own merits.
 9. For that reason the proposal would be consistent with the requirements of Policy BD1 of the Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 which requires, amongst other things, that development is compatible with and contributes to the character of the area and is appropriate to the locality, and Policy BD5 which requires that extensions complement and do not dominate the existing property.

Living Conditions

10. The conservatory would project some 3m along the common boundary with No 4. That boundary is currently marked by a solid fence. Whilst the conservatory would be higher than the fence, the difference would not be excessive and, in the context of the long rear gardens would not be unduly overbearing or create an unacceptable sense of enclosure to the neighbouring property.
11. No 8, on the opposite side of the site, is a modern detached house, set slightly away from the common boundary. The conservatory would not project across the entire width of the building and, following the form of the existing extension, would leave a set back to the side adjacent to No 8. The proposed development would be visible from the rear of No 8 but as a result of its

position, scale and appearance would not be a dominant or overbearing feature.

12. Consequently, the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. As such the proposal would be in line with Policy SP3 of the Redbridge Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 which, amongst other things, requires all new development to respect the amenity of adjoining properties and the locality generally.

Conditions and Conclusion

13. In the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty I have imposed the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have specified that matching materials are used in the development.
14. For the reasons set out above and subject to these conditions, and taking all other matters raised into account, the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR