
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2019

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/19/3236772

**Development site at garage block rear of 662-686 Green Lane,
Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9RX**

- 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 & Mrs Stephen Waldock against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1796/19, dated 20 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is to demolish the existing structure and the erection of 1x1 and 6x2 bedroom dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Hazeldene Road and 2 Colinton Road, with particular regard to outlook, overshadowing, daylight and sunlight;
 - whether satisfactory living conditions would be provided for future occupiers of the proposed houses, with particular regard to layout, internal and external space; and
 - whether the proposed parking and access arrangements would be satisfactory.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located at the rear of Green Lane which is a busy through route with a mixture of commercial, community and residential uses. The site is within a cobbled passageway which provides rear access to commercial properties at 662-686 Green Lane. The passageway links two side roads, Hazeldene Road at the western end and Colinton Road to the east, both of which are predominately residential in character. At the Hazeldene Road end there is also a vehicle tyre and exhaust centre, with a petrol filling station opposite.

4. The site is currently occupied by a row of 22 disused garages with steeply pitched, staggered roofs. At both ends of the row, the garages are lower in height, with mono-pitched roofs. These end garages project further forward than the adjacent residential properties on Hazeldene Road and Colinton Road.
5. The proposed development would replace the garages with a two-storey building which would provide 7 one and two-bedroom houses. At each end of the building, replacing the existing mono-pitch garages, would be a single storey flat roofed garage. The main part of the building would have a hipped roof, with a flat roofed section around the front, side and part of the rear elevation. This flat roofed section would help to minimise the height of the roof and as a result, the building would be approximately 1.8 metres higher to the ridge than the existing garages. However, the increase in the ground to eaves height on the front elevation would be significantly more.
6. The modern appearance of the building, with its mixture of two-storey and double fronted windows, would not reflect the character of the traditional bay fronted houses on Hazeldene Road and Colinton Road. Given the mixture of building styles in the surrounding area, a more modern design could be acceptable in this location.
7. However, with its increased ground to eaves height, the building would be significantly higher than the existing garages. The passageway is narrow and the building would front directly onto it, with no set back or break in the building line. Whilst the design of the building broadly reflects the siting and form of the existing garages, it would be much higher and bulkier, and would appear overly large and oppressive within its setting, causing harm to the character of the area.
8. The eaves height would be lower on the middle section of the rear elevation, where it would adjoin the rear gardens of 1 Hazeldene Road and 2 Colinton Road. I note the Council's concerns about the inconsistent eaves heights, but the sections of higher eaves would be immediately behind the two houses and as a result, this inconsistency in eaves height would not be readily visible. Similarly, the lack of rear windows would not be obvious from the street.
9. Notwithstanding that, due to its scale and bulk the building would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (RLP) which promotes high quality design that respects the local character and makes a positive architectural and urban design contribution.

Living conditions of nearby occupiers

10. The existing garages back onto the side elevations of 1 Hazeldene Road and 2 Colinton Road and their rear gardens. The appellant says that the eaves height along the boundary has been reduced to minimise the impact on the neighbouring occupiers. Nonetheless, the result of the proposal would be to increase the height of built development by approximately 1.4 metres to the eaves along the length of the boundary. The gardens are not particularly wide, and the effect of the increased height would be overbearing and oppressive for the occupiers of these two properties.
11. The site is located to the north of the two immediately adjoining dwellings, so would not cause undue overshadowing or loss of sunlight. However, due to the

scale of the building along the shared boundary, it would reduce the overall levels of daylight to the rear habitable rooms of these properties.

12. I conclude on this issue that the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Hazeldene Road and 2 Colinton Road with particular regard to outlook and daylight. The proposal would conflict with Policy LP26 which requires that development does not result in an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Living conditions of future occupiers

13. In its appeal statement the Council has acknowledged that the Gross Internal Area of the proposed dwellings would meet the Nationally Described Space Standards (2015). However, the Council remains concerned about the standard of accommodation, in particular the internal layout and lack of external amenity space.
14. RLP Policy LP29 requires that for new houses, 50 square metres of private amenity space is provided per dwelling, with a lower requirement of 5 square metres for flats. In this case, no private external open space has been provided and the internal layout does not compensate for this, being only slightly above the minimum national standards. I acknowledge that the site is close to Goodmayes Park, a large area of public open space which would provide opportunities for recreation and play, but this does not make up for the lack of private external open space.
15. The dwellings would have a single, northerly aspect and would look out over the relatively narrow passageway. As a result of their orientation, the houses would feel dark with minimal direct sunlight, and their outlook over parked cars and the backs of buildings on Green Lane would be unattractive. Furthermore, the lack of any private space at the front of the building would mean that the ground floor windows would look directly onto the street, with little privacy. These factors would contribute to an unacceptable standard of accommodation.
16. I therefore conclude that, having regard to the proposed layout, internal and external space, the proposal would not provide satisfactory living conditions for future residents. Consequently, it would conflict with the requirements for amenity space contained in Policy LP29.

Access and parking arrangements

17. Two parking spaces would be provided in the garages at either end of the block, with the remaining provision of 8 spaces immediately outside the front of the building in the passageway. The planning officer's report notes that for 1-2 person dwellings, Policy 6.3 of the London Plan requires that less than 1 parking space is required. I acknowledge the planning officer's comments that there would be a shortfall of parking, but to my reading of the standards the proposed level of parking appears to be adequate. However, it is also necessary to consider whether the arrangements for access and parking are appropriate and workable.
18. The passageway currently provides rear vehicular access to the premises on Green Lane for servicing. The proposal would involve a one-way system in the passageway to enable the continuation of the existing access arrangements alongside the parking for the development. However, the passageway is fairly narrow and with cars parked along one side as is proposed, it could become

blocked if vehicles serving the Green Lane properties were not moved promptly. This could result in additional congestion in the immediate surrounding area.

19. In addition, no dedicated space for pedestrians would be provided, meaning that people would need to walk in the middle of the passageway, around parked cars. This could result in conflicts between road users.
20. Given the narrow width of the passageway and its existing use as an access, I agree that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed parking and access arrangements would be appropriate.
21. The appellant says that the number of vehicles using the road would be reduced, given that there are 22 garages in the block. However, do not appear to be in current use and no evidence about the current or predicted number of vehicles using the road has been provided to support this claim. Furthermore, the garages provide space for off street parking so their use would be unlikely to cause congestion in the passageway.
22. I conclude on this issue that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed access and parking arrangements would be satisfactory. Whilst the amount of car parking would be acceptable in terms of the requirements in Policy RLP LP23, the proposal is contrary to section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires that safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users.

Other Matters

23. The appellant has drawn my attention to the houses which have recently been built in Holly Lane, which is a similar passageway to the appeal site, further along Green Lane. However, this situation is different in that the houses have been built on the Green Lane side of the passageway, and the garage block has been retained. I have no information as to the traffic and parking arrangements in that case. In any event, I have determined the appeal on its merits and the existence of another similar situation elsewhere does not justify allowing this proposal, which is unacceptable for the reasons set out.

Conclusion

24. I conclude that, for the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR