



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2020

by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/19/3242736

Nos 6 and 8 Atherton Road, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0PF

- 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 Manraj Atwal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3738/19, dated 22 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey and first floor rear extensions. Loft conversion with rear dormer incorporating two Juliet balconies. Hip to gable roof alteration. Three front roof lights per house. Neighbour matching roof over existing front two-storey bay window feature. Two new windows in both side flank wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of No 10 Atherton Road, with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a pair of semi-detached dwellings in a predominately residential area. The area is characterised by a regular pattern of two storey semi-detached dwellings. Despite the alterations and extensions that the properties have undergone over time, which have altered the individual design characteristics, there are still design similarities to the properties.
4. The proposal is for a single storey ground floor and first floor rear extensions, as well as loft conversions and alterations to the roof. To the front elevation, the proposal would alter the existing roof shape and install a number of rooflights. However, given that this is proposed to both dwellings, this would not disrupt the symmetry of the existing building and would not be out of character within the existing street scene. Therefore, I find this element would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and areas.

5. In terms of the rear elevation, at the ground floor the rear extension, when added to the existing built form would have a total depth of approximately 6 metres from the main elevation of the host property. Although the proposed ground floor rear extension at No 6 Atherton Road would be set in slightly from the side elevation, the depth of the proposal would still be similar to No 8 Atherton Road. The first floor extension would project approximately 3 metres and the proposal would also add a dormer with Juliet balconies on the rear roof. The width of the proposed rear extensions, aside from the ground floor element of No 6, would cover the width of the host dwelling.
6. The proposed dormers, when combined with the extensions on the other floors, would form bulky dominant structures on the rear elevation. The proposal would not appear subservient to the host dwelling and would significantly alter the appearance of the existing hipped roof and would unbalance the overall appearance of the dwelling, which would be harmful to its appearance. The proposal would also install two large side windows on each side of the building, which would stretch across all levels of the building. During my site visit I did not observe any similar designs in the local vicinity, therefore, it would be in stark contrast to the designs of nearby properties. I note the appellant has stated that the windows would provide a modern internal look and increase natural light into the house and would not be readily visible from the street scene. Whilst I acknowledge the benefit of additional light inside the properties, some views of the windows would be possible from the road and from neighbouring properties due to the gaps between the adjacent properties.
7. The appellant has referred to their permitted development rights as a potential fall-back position, but I do not have substantive evidence to suggest the appellant would genuinely pursue this option if the appeal failed, or that such a scheme would be similar to, or worse than, what is currently proposed. As such, it is a matter of negligible weight.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to various properties in the local vicinity which also have ground extensions, first floor extensions and loft conversions. Whilst I have photographs of these properties, I do not have full details of all the schemes, their planning status or what circumstances may have led to their approval. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits and with its own immediate context and they do not justify the harm I have identified.
9. I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. Therefore, it would be contrary to policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) and the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019). These policies and guidance seek new development to be high quality and subordinate to the existing building in terms of size and scale.

Living conditions

10. The neighbouring dwelling at No 10 Atherton Road does not have a rear extension. Therefore, the proposed ground floor extension to No 8, would extend the built form at this level to approximately 6 metres beyond the neighbouring property, and 3 metres at the first floor level. Due to the excessive depth of the proposal at ground and first floor levels, the proposal would have an overbearing and imposing impact, on the occupiers of the neighbouring property when in their property and garden. This would be harmful to the outlook experienced by the occupiers.

11. The appellant has suggested that the proposal could be amended to a different roof design to lessen the impact on No 10. However, I have determined the appeal as submitted, as the guidance¹ is clear that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme.
12. The appellant has also made reference to other 6 metre rear extensions in the local area. However, their presence does not necessarily make this proposal acceptable. In any case, I do not have full details of all the schemes, their planning status, or what circumstances led to their approval. I have determined the appeal as submitted, on its own planning merits and within its own immediate context.
13. I find that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 10 Atherton Road, with particular reference to outlook. Therefore, it would be contrary to policies LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) and the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019). These policies and guidance require householder extensions to maintain an acceptable outlook from surrounding dwellings.

Other Matters

14. I recognise that not all of the neighbours have raised objections to the proposal, and I had regard to the desire of the appellant to provide accommodation for their family. However, I am mindful that the harm identified would be permanent and is not outweighed by the appellants' particular circumstances.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

D Peppitt

INSPECTOR

¹ Annex M of the Procedural Guide Planning Appeals – England