



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2019

by M Heron BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3236847

318 Horns Road, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1BS

- 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 Naveed Bashir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1457/19, dated 1 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with flat roof and 3no. roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension with flat roof and 3no. roof lights at 318 Horns Road, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1BS, in accordance with the application Ref. 1457/19, dated 1 April 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: JS/SP/425/4/00, JS/SP/425/4/01, JS/SP/425/4/02, JS/SP/425/4/03, JS/SP/425/4/04 and JS/SP/425/4/05.
 - 3) With the exception of the flat roof which shall be constructed of felt, the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and wider area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupants at neighbouring properties, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. Horns Road is a residential street characterised by a variety of properties, some of which have been extended. No 318 is a two storey, semi-detached,

dwelling located on the eastern side of the carriageway. It has a part single/part two storey rear extension and, similar to several nearby properties, benefits from a relatively long rear garden.

4. This proposal seeks permission to construct a full width single storey rear extension. This would have a maximum depth of three metres and would be constructed under a flat roof with a maximum height of three metres. I appreciate that the cumulative additions to No 318 would result in a fairly lengthy extension to this property. Nevertheless, the siting of the proposal would not be conspicuous within the streetscene. In addition, given its scale, a significant proportion of the rear garden would remain and, whilst positioned close to the site boundaries, it would not unacceptably draw the eye from the rear gardens of surrounding properties.
5. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the modest scheme would be an unobtrusive addition to No 318 that would not unduly dominate its rear elevation. Even when viewed in conjunction with the existing rear extension, I am therefore satisfied that, on balance, the proposal would not significantly unbalance the design of the host property. Consequently, in these particular circumstances, the scheme would not unacceptably disrupt the overall appearance of No 318 or the rhythm of nearby dwellings. In reaching this view I am also aware that it would assist considerably with the health of a family member.
6. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property and wider area. It would therefore accord with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (LP) insofar as they seek to ensure that extensions are subordinate and acceptable in terms of scale and that developments respect local character.

Living Conditions

7. The proposal would only extend approximately three metres beyond an existing full width rear extension at the adjoining No 320 Horns Road. In addition, only a small part of it would be visible above the existing boundary fence. Consequently, I find that the scale and positioning of the proposal would not appear visually oppressive from within No 320 or its rear garden.
8. Turning to the adjacent No 316 Horns Road, this property also has a full width single storey rear extension. A structure, constructed of temporary type materials, adjoins this extension and appears to have a depth of at least three metres. The proposal would not extend beyond these single storey features at No 316. However, even if the structure constructed of temporary materials was found to be unlawful and subsequently removed, the proposal would not significantly extend beyond the rear of No 316. Overall, I find that its scale and positioning would therefore not appear unduly dominant from within this neighbouring property or its rear garden.
9. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would not result in significant harm to the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties in terms of outlook. This is so even when viewed in conjunction with the existing rear extension at No 318. The proposal would therefore accord with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the LP insofar as they seek to ensure that developments do not result in harm to living conditions in terms of outlook.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council. Having regard to the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I have amended the wording where necessary in the interests of clarity and simplicity. In addition to the standard time limit, a condition specifying the plans is required in the interests of certainty. A condition to ensure that the materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building, with the exception of the roof which shall be constructed using felt, is necessary in order to protect the character and appearance of the host property.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would adhere to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, the appeal should be allowed.

M Heron

INSPECTOR