



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 January 2020

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/18/3217664

66 Canterbury Avenue, Ilford, IG1 3NG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ashra Pandore against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4252/18, dated 17 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with a depth of 6 metres, highest point of 3 metres and height at the eaves of 3 metres.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended, under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Part A.4(7) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received. My determination of this appeal has been made on the same basis.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an un-extended mid-terrace property, constructed in brick and render. At ground-floor level to the rear there is a kitchen window, door and set of patio doors close to the boundary. One neighbouring property, 68 Canterbury Avenue has been extended along the common boundary, the other, 64 Canterbury Avenue, has not.
4. It is proposed to extend the property to the rear across the full width of the ground floor, to 6m depth, with 3m eaves and maximum height, using matching materials, meeting the relevant requirements of Part 1, Class A. The extension is proposed along the boundary line between the appeal site and No 64 and would result in the loss of the substantial shrubbery on the appeal site side of that boundary. The wall would therefore be close to the ground floor habitable room of the neighbouring property, which has windows and doors mirroring those of the appeal site.
5. Coupled with its height, the depth and location of the proposal leads me to conclude that it would unacceptably increase the sense of enclosure to and loss of outlook from the neighbouring property. Owing to the orientation of the

properties, the proposal would be unlikely to cause any unacceptable overshadowing, however I consider that it would reduce the overall level of light received by the neighbouring property. In combination with the increased sense of enclosure and loss of outlook, the proposal would therefore be harmful to the amenity of the adjoining property.

6. Whilst I acknowledge that there is an existing boundary fence and shrubbery along the boundary between the appeal site and No 64, the proposed extension would be more substantial, and I consider that its effect would therefore be greater.
7. I note that No 68 has been extended in a similar manner to the appeal proposal. As such the proposal would not harm the amenity of that property. However, for the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposal would harm the amenity of No 64 which adjoins the appeal site.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR