
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3238761

6 Raymond Road, Newbury Park, Ilford IG2 7EA

- 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 Mrs Luthfun Nessa Bari against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3227/19, dated 29 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the extension on:
 - The character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of No 4 Raymond Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling in a residential area that consists of similar houses that are mainly semi-detached or short terraces. The property already has a single storey rear extension that extends the full width of the house. The proposed first floor extension would sit above part of this but would not be as deep or as wide.
4. The *Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (adopted September 2019)* (SPD) indicates that in order to remain proportionate and subordinate to the host property, first floor rear extensions should not normally be more than half the width of the original rear elevation. I note the materials and the design of the windows and roof would match those of the original dwelling. However, the proposed extension would be nearly two thirds the width of the rear elevation. Given this, and the depth it would project, the proposed extension would be an overly-dominant and disproportionate addition to the host property, and would not be subordinate to it. As such, it would be detrimental to both the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider area.

5. I observed that a nearby dwelling had a similarly sized first floor extension as well as other rear extensions. Whilst I do not know the full circumstances that led to this being considered acceptable, its approval clearly predates the recently adopted SPD which changes the basis on which proposals are to be assessed. As a result, it does not represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal.
6. All in all, I consider that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the *Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (adopted March 2018)* (RLP) which requires that developments have a high quality of design that respects the local character and that house extensions are subordinate to the existing building.

Living Conditions

7. No 4 Raymond Road is located on a corner plot and is at an angle to No 6. It has a number of first floor windows on its rear elevation, but those nearest to No 6 are small windows that appear to serve non-habitable rooms, with the larger windows that appeared to serve bedrooms being located away from the common boundary. Whilst angled views of the proposed extension would be possible from all the windows, none of them would directly face it.
8. Moreover, given the distance and position of the windows that appeared to serve the bedrooms, any views of the extension from them would be incidental to their main outlook which would continue to be over the rear gardens of the surrounding houses. As such, the extension would not dominate the outlook from them.
9. Whilst a part of the extension may be within the 45 degree line of the nearest first floor window, I am satisfied that even if this does serve a habitable room, the distance and orientation of it relative to the extension, would ensure it would not appear an obtrusive or overly dominant feature from it.
10. Consequently, I consider that the proposed extension would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 4 Raymond Road, with particular regard to outlook. Therefore, in this respect there would be no conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the RLP which require that developments do not have an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

11. Although I have found the proposal would not have an adverse impact with regard to living conditions, it would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. For this reason, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR