
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2019 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3235324

223 Dawlish Drive, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9EH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Uddin against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2528/19, is dated 13 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2019.
 - The development is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site consists of a modest two-storey mid terraced property which is set in an established residential area. The surrounding properties are similar in scale and many of which, including the neighbouring property at No.225, contain modest sized single storey rear extensions. Most rear extensions to the east of the appeal site are of a similar depth which provides a sense of uniformity.
5. According to drawing No. PP/03, the proposed development would extend beyond the rear extension at No.225 by 3 meters resulting in an extension slightly in excess of 6m deep. The proposed extension would also extend 3.3 meters beyond the original rear elevation of No.221.
6. The appellant suggests there are other rear extensions near to the appeal site which are up to 6m in depth. During my site visit, I had clear visibility of the rear of the houses to the east of the appeal site, as well as of No.219 to the west. It could be seen that the rear extensions at these properties were a similar depth to the extension at No.225 and I did not witness any other extensions in the immediate vicinity that were significantly deeper than that at

No.225. Indeed, most of the other 6m extensions referred to by the appellant are at houses on the other side of Dawlish Drive, so do not affect the setting of the proposal.

7. The depth of the proposed extension would be greater than the nearest other rear extensions and so, though there is no defined limit to the depth of rear extensions, it would fail to respect the general pattern of the immediate surrounding area. The scale of the proposed development would be excessive and disproportionate in the context of the modest sized host dwelling and terrace it is a part of. It would therefore appear to be a bulky and incongruous addition which disrupts the sense of uniformity along this section of Dawlish Drive.
8. For these reasons, therefore, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, March 2018, which generally seek to ensure developments are well designed and respect the local character.

Other Matters

9. The appellant draws attention to two appeal decisions. However, these are both many years old and different policies were referred to in these decisions compared to the current development plan. Furthermore, I do not have full details of the appeal sites and the context in which they are set. Therefore, I cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
10. The appellant states the Council's failure to withdraw permitted development rights would suggest the proposed extension would generally be acceptable. However, this does not suggest the character of the neighbourhood does not need safeguarding from harmful development, such as that proposed.
11. The screening provided by the boundary treatment, the extension's absence of visibility in the street scene, and the lack of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, would not outweigh the harm identified above.

Recommendation and Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR