

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2019

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3229954

52 Primrose Road, South Woodford, Essex, E18 1DE.

- 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 Ms. Darvell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0236/19, dated 18 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey 2.5m rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey 2.5m rear extension at 52 Primrose Road, South Woodford, Essex E18 1DE, in accordance with the terms of application ref: 0236/19 dated 18 January 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) This permission shall relate to the following plans: 587/1 (existing plan and elevations), 587/2 (proposed plan and elevations), 587/3 (location plan), and 587/4 (existing and proposed section and block plan)
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those on the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining properties, Nos. 50 and 54 Primrose Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property of Victorian age. It is located in a road of similar age and style properties, some within terraces, which generally have long, narrow rear gardens.
4. The dwelling on the appeal site has been previously extended to the rear with a two-storey addition. No. 50 to the south has also been extended with a two storey addition of greater depth. No. 54 to the north has a single storey rear addition to a similar depth as the two storey extension on the appeal site.
5. The proposal would involve the removal of an existing single storey detached outbuilding which lies close to the rear elevation of the appeal site property, and which is sited almost right up to the boundary with No. 54. It has a

pitched roof and is set on land that is slightly higher than the ground level of the dwelling on the appeal site and that at No. 54.

6. The proposal would extend to a depth of 2.5 metres from the rear elevation of the dwelling, to a point that is roughly half the depth of the existing outbuilding, and would have a flat roof. It would be set at the same level as the house such that its overall height would be below that of the existing outbuilding.
7. Although the proposal would be sited close to the boundary with No 54 and would extend the continuous wall along this boundary, it is my view that its overall impact would not be significantly different from the existing situation. Indeed, I consider that it would be likely to have a slight beneficial effect on the light received and outlook from this property as a result of the removal of the outbuilding which is higher and extends to a greater depth from the rear elevation. Whilst there is a modest gap between the rear elevation of the existing dwelling and the outbuilding on the appeal site, it provides little light or outlook to No. 54, which is in any event further affected by the existing high close boarded fence sited on the boundary. Overall, I consider the relationship with this property would be acceptable.
8. With regard to No. 50, the proposed extension would be sited about a metre from the common boundary with this property. In addition, the flank wall of the rear extension of this adjoining property is set away from this boundary by a greater distance. Although there are ground floor windows in the side elevation facing the appeal site, it is my view that taking into account this separation and the relatively modest depth of extension proposed there would not be a significant impact on the light received or outlook from these or from the property in general. This relationship would be acceptable.
9. I therefore find that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of either 50 or 54 Primrose Road. It would therefore accord with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (LP) which promote high quality design that respects the local character of the area, is well integrated and has regard to and respect for the surrounding area, and does not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
10. For the reasons given above it would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework in particular paragraphs 117, 124 and 127 which, amongst other things, promote an effective use of land while safeguarding and improving the environment, and the creation of high quality places and buildings, sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.
11. In respect of conditions, in addition to one to refer to the approved plans in the interests of proper planning, a condition to ensure that the extension is built of matching materials is necessary in the interests of visual amenity.

Conclusions

12. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR