



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by L Gilbert BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3228748

64 Queenborough Gardens, Barkingside, Ilford IG2 6YB

- 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 Stefan Coman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 5155/18, dated 12 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2019.
 - The development is for a single storey rear structure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The planning application form states that the development has already been completed. The fact that the development has been undertaken without planning permission is not a reason in itself to dismiss the appeal. I saw on my site visit that the structure had been constructed. However, the structure differed to what is shown on the plans. This is because the corrugated roof material overhung its sides, and a low wooden board and gates enclosed the rear. I will assess the materials I viewed on site. Notwithstanding the appellant's original description of development being for a temporary structure it is an act of development. I have therefore determined the appeal in this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - The character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and
 - The living conditions of adjoining occupiers, with particular reference to outlook and sense of enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The site contains a mid-terraced, two-storey property with a long, narrow rear garden. The surrounding area is predominantly residential. The majority of the row of terraced houses have been extended with modest depth single

storey rear extensions. However, the adjoining property of 66 Queenborough Gardens has not been extended at the rear.

5. The appeal development is a flat roofed single storey structure, which is attached to a single storey rear extension at the host property. I find that the combined depth of the single storey additions at the property and height of the structure, are excessively bulky at the rear of the house. This is out of keeping with the overall pattern of development along the adjoining terrace, as its depth protrudes beyond the prevailing building line of rear extensions in the locality.
6. The single storey structure is constructed from wood, with corrugated sheets on the roof and parts of the sides. Much of the rear of this structure is left open, with low level wooden boards and gates to enclose it. Many of the properties in the adjoining terrace have single storey rear extensions of either a more traditional design or ones that complement the host dwelling. In contrast, the appeal development is of poor design and has been constructed from low quality materials and finishes, which in turn fails to complement the character and appearance of the surrounding area or host property.
7. Accordingly, I find that the appeal development harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It conflicts with Policies LP26 and LP30 Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted March 2018. These policies seek, amongst other things, for development to be of a high-quality design, complementing character, particularly in terms of scale, form and materials.

Living conditions

8. As a result of the use of low-quality materials and finishes on the structure, it harms the outlook from both the neighbour's rear gardens at 62 and 66 Queenborough Gardens.
9. The neighbouring property of 66 Queenborough Gardens has not been extended. On my site visit, I could see an open garden parasol located on the external space, directly behind this neighbour's house. This suggests that this garden area is more intensively used. The combined mass of the extensions at 64 Queenborough Gardens and height of the appeal development, creates a harmful sense of enclosure to 66 Queenborough Gardens and its garden, especially to the external space directly behind the house. However, the impact on 62 Queenborough Gardens would not be significantly harmful, because this neighbour has a single storey extension which shields part of the massing of the extensions at 64 Queenborough Gardens.
10. Consequently, I find that the appeal development harms the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, with particular reference to the outlook from 62 and 66 Queenborough Gardens and sense of enclosure to 66 Queenborough Gardens. It is contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted March 2018, these policies seek, amongst other things, that development does not have an adverse impact upon neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

11. The appellant refers to the development only being used in good weather. However, the structure will remain in place regardless of the weather. The appellant also mentions that it does not involve public space, it retains the site

access and a parking area should allow vehicles to turn within the site.
However, these matters do not overcome the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

L Gilbert

INSPECTOR