



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by S Thomas BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3244572

6 Wallington Road, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 8QQ

- 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 Mamun Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3224/19, dated 23 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed construction of single storey side/rear extension. Part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and on (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Wallington Road in respect of outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is semi-detached and located in a residential street of predominantly semi-detached properties. It has a two-storey projection to the rear and in common with the general pattern of these rear projections does not span the width of the property at first floor level. A number of the properties along the street also have additional single storey extensions to the rear.
4. The Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD) states that it is important single storey extensions do not dominate the original property and states the maximum depth from the original house for semi-detached properties should be 3.5m. Depths greater than this would only be acceptable where consistent with adjoining properties. In respect of first floor rear extensions these should not project more than 3m from the original house and the first-floor element should generally be no more than half the width of the original rear elevation to ensure it is proportionate and subordinate to the original dwelling.
5. The rear projection is currently subordinate to the existing dwelling. The proposed development would infill the existing gap from the rear projection to the side elevation of the property adjacent to 4 Wallington Road (No. 4) at both single storey and first storey level. This would have the effect of extending the

- existing rear projection across the width of the house and altering this key feature. The proposed roof form and infilling at first floor level would appear at odds with the character of the dwelling and visually unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties.
6. Similarly, the single storey rear extension would span the width of the rear elevation of the dwelling and project approximately 4m from the rear elevation in excess of the maximum depth for single storey extensions as allowed in the SPD. This would extend further into the garden area than neighbouring single storey extensions and would thus be uncharacteristic. Together, the proposed extensions would be a dominant feature and would fail to be proportionate and subordinate to the existing dwelling. It would thus cause harm to its character and appearance.
 7. I acknowledge the existence of similar extensions at Nos 10 and 12 Wallington Road. However, I do not have the full details and planning circumstances which led to these being constructed. In any event, the existence of these extensions confirms my view that the appeal scheme would be acceptable.
 8. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and thus would be in conflict with Policy LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018). Amongst other things, this policy seeks that household extensions complement the character of a building, are subordinate in terms of size and scale or height and incorporate a roof profile sympathetic to the existing dwelling. I turn now to living conditions.
 9. The neighbouring property No. 4 is located forward of the rear elevation of the appeal property. Whilst the proposed extension would infill the current gap in the rear projection there will still exist a separation between the side elevation of the proposed extension and the boundary. I have considered the available evidence and find that the proposed extension would not breach the 45-degree line. Further, considering the separation between the extension and the boundary and the relationship between the properties, whilst the extension would be of a greater height and depth than allowed in the SPD, I do not find that it would have an unacceptably overbearing effect on next door. Thus, the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. In this regard, it would not conflict with Policy LP30, which also seeks to avoid adverse impacts on neighbouring properties.
 10. Whilst I acknowledge the proposed extension would improve the quality of the living conditions for its occupants, this is not outweighed by the harm I find to the character and appearance of the dwelling.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal is dismissed.

Stephen Thomas

INSPECTOR