



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2019

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3232979

26 Trentbridge Close, Hainault, Ilford IG6 3DG

- 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 Mindas Carteret against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0864/19, dated 17 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 27 Trentbridge Close having particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling located in the modern housing estate of Trentbridge Close. The dwelling has a proportionately sized rear garden that backs onto an unmade lane which provides vehicular access to domestic garages within the rear gardens of properties on Penrith Road.
4. The proposed garage would be located at the far end of the garden with vehicular access directly onto the unmade lane. The development would extend nearly the complete width of the garden and it would require the removal of a semi-mature tree. The garage would be visible within the area from surrounding properties and gardens due to its positioning at the bottom of the garden and its height above the boundary fence.
5. Timber buildings are noticeable features close to the appeal site, although these are typical garden sheds and are small in size. There are no other garages in gardens on this side of the lane, although the pattern of

development in the area does include garages in the back gardens of houses on Penrith Road. These are predominantly flat roofed.

6. The proposed garage would be taller in comparison to the garages on Penrith Road as a result of its pitched roof. This would emphasise its scale and mass in this modest sized garden, and would furthermore be a new and discordant feature to this part of Trentbridge Close. The building would be wider than the host dwelling and in terms of footprint, would not significantly differ from the footprint of the main dwelling. Therefore, its size would not be subordinate to the host dwelling, and it would appear visually prominent when viewed from surrounding gardens and the unmade lane. It would therefore appear out of character with the area.
7. I have taken into consideration the proposal to use facing materials to match the host dwelling, but this does not outweigh my finding that the development would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. On the basis that the scale and massing of the proposed development would appear as an overly prominent feature in the street scene, this would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, and would conflict with policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted 2018) that requires new development to be of high quality, and amongst other things, respectful of local character, having regard to the surrounding area in terms of layout, massing and scale. This policy is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in seeking high quality design that is sympathetic to local character.

Living Conditions

9. The attached house of 27 Trentbridge Close has a garden that corresponds in terms of width and length to the appeal garden. The garage would be positioned along the shared boundary and would be visible from both the habitable room windows to the rear elevation and from the garden, which currently enjoys an open outlook. The boundary fence between the two properties would not significantly screen the garage from view.
10. Given the combination of position of the garage in close proximity to the attached neighbour, its scale and mass, within the modestly sized garden, it would appear visually dominant and intrusive when viewed from the neighbours' perspective. It would thus have an adverse impact on their living conditions in terms of loss of outlook.
11. Therefore, for the reasons above, I consider the proposal would be in conflict with policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted 2018). This policy seeks to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupants, and amongst other matters, outlook, and aligns with the Framework to ensure that new development, as well as other aims, provides a high standard of amenity.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR