
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2019

by Stephen Wilkinson BA BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3239527

36 Abbotswood Gardens, Clayhall, Ilford, IG5 OBG

- 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 R Selverajan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2514/19, dated 4 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the proposed development on:
 - the living conditions of occupiers of No.34 Abbotswood Gardens through a loss of daylight and outlook, and
 - the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached residential property which has been extended with a rear roof dormer, single storey rear and side extensions and a first floor extension. The adjacent property, No.34 has a ground floor extension which projects beyond the rear boundary of the appeal site by approximately 0.5m. The boundary treatment between the two properties comprises a wall of about 1.7m in height. Other properties in the area have been extended.
4. The proposed extension would be of overall modest proportions measuring about 2.7m in height with a depth of approximately 3m and extending by about 2.4m beyond the existing extension to the neighbouring property, No.34 Abbotswood Gardens.
5. However, given the aspect of the appeal site and its proximity to the neighbouring property with rear walls facing northeast, ensuring sufficient daylight to rear rooms, is particularly important. The rear wall of the neighbouring property includes a large window which serves a habitable room. The depth of the proposed extension together with its height at just about 1m

above the height of the existing boundary fence would result in an unacceptable loss of daylight to this window. In addition, the depth of the extension together with its height would result in a harmful sense of enclosure to the rear garden area, thus adversely impacting on outlook for the occupiers of No.34 Abbotswood Gardens.

6. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed extension would adversely affect the living conditions of the neighbouring property thereby being in conflict with policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018), which seeks to ensure that new development avoids adverse impacts on neighbouring properties through loss of daylight and outlook.

Character and appearance

7. The area's character and appearance is determined by pairs of semi-detached residential properties with modestly sized rear gardens. Given the cumulative scale of the extensions already built at the appeal site the proposal would result in further development of this site which has already been extended at ground, first floor and roof levels.
8. Given the size of the rear garden and the location of the proposed extension its impacts only affect the neighbouring property I do not accept that it would adversely impact on the character and appearance of the wider area. The extension would only be readily visible from the neighbouring properties.
9. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed extension would not impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore, not be in conflict with the adopted policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 which amongst other matters, require that householder development respect the character of its surroundings.

Conclusions

10. Whilst I have not found harm to the area's character and appearance, the harmful effects that would result to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers lead me to conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Stephen Wilkinson

INSPECTOR