



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2020

by M Seaton DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12 May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/19/3241258
74 Meads Lane, Ilford, IG3 8QN

- 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 Teja Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3558/19, dated 6 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor rear extension.
-

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 area; and,
 - whether the proposals would safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, having regard to light, outlook and enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site occupies a position at the junction between Meads Lane and Mitcham Road, and accommodates a previously extended two-storey building. The property possesses an existing rear yard area with a gated access on to Mitcham Road, and beyond the yard to the North is a two-storey detached property, No.1A/1B Mitcham Road. The property has already been extended at both ground and first floor levels.
4. The proposed extension would have a depth of 3.8 metres and a width of 4.9 metres, which would match the width of the previous first floor extension. Whilst the proposal would only extend 3.0 metres further to the rear than the adjoining existing outrigger due to a setback in the position of the existing rear elevation, the proposal would further extend an existing extension to a cumulative depth of 8.6 metres, measured at roof level.
5. The Council has drawn my attention to the Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) adopted September 2019. The SPD sets out guidance for first floor rear extensions, including that the depth should

generally be kept to a maximum of 3 metres and will need to ensure that it is proportionate and subordinate to the host property. With the appeal property set in a corner location, I am also mindful that the SPD guides that bulky extensions on corner plots may be resisted where they fail to remain subordinate to the host property and present a large blank wall to the side street.

6. In this instance, the proposed development would maintain the ridge height of the previous extension to the property, which in itself is subordinate to the height of the roof ridge of the main part of the property facing on to Meads Lane. However, subordinacy must also be considered with regards the cumulative effect of extensions to the original property. The original property has been significantly extended and the cumulative impact of the proposed extension when taken in combination with existing ground and first floor extensions would overwhelm the character and appearance of the original building.
7. The massing of the proposed extension would appear as a substantial and obtrusive addition to the building when viewed from Mitcham Road, the adverse visual effect of which would be exacerbated by the absence of any architectural detailing or fenestration within the first-floor elevation running parallel to the street. Whilst the use of matching materials would at least in part assimilate it with the appearance of the host building, the incorporation of unbalanced eaves on the proposed extension, and lower than those on the existing property would present a further awkward detailed design feature.
8. For these reasons, the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted March 2018 (the Local Plan), and the guidance within the SPD. These policies and guidance require high quality design in all development by ensuring that proposals respect the local character of the area and make a positive architectural and urban design contribution to its context and location, and are well integrated having regard and respect for the surrounding area in terms of layout, form, massing and scale amongst other things, with household extensions expected to complement the character of the host building in terms of scale, and be subordinate.

Living conditions

9. The proposed extension would reduce the existing gap between the first-floor built form of the appeal property and Nos 1A & 1B Mitcham Road. I have had careful regard to the Council's concerns over the impact of the proposed extension on the outlook from habitable room windows in the Mitcham Road properties, and a contended increased sense of enclosure. However, whilst I accept that the gap between the properties at first floor level would be reduced, a reasonable gap would nevertheless remain between the gable end of the proposed extension and the neighbouring property. Whilst undoubtedly the outlook from habitable room windows at Nos. 1A & 1B Mitcham Road would alter due to the erection and position of the proposed extension, I am not persuaded based on my observations that there would be an unacceptable impact on the outlook of neighbouring occupiers, or that the resultant proximity of the proposals would result in an adverse sense of enclosure.

10. The Council also highlighted within the Officer Report that the proposed extension would have an adverse effect on the existing adjacent rear window of the host property, when applying the guidance provided by the *45-degree rule*. On the basis of the plans, I do not disagree with the Council's conclusion over the impact on the affected window. However, the SPD is clear at paragraph 3.3.4 that the application of this guidance is *to evaluate the impact on neighbouring properties*. The window in question relates to the host property and as such the guidance would not be applicable in accordance with the SPD. Any impact on light available from that window is therefore a matter for the appellant.
11. For the above reasons, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, having regard to light, outlook and enclosure. There would not therefore be conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Local Plan, or the guidance set out within the SPD. These policies and guidance seek to ensure that new development and household extensions do not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in relation to daylight/sunlight and outlook.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to the benefits of the provision of additional accommodation and that the proposed development would use energy efficient materials. However, the provision of additional accommodation to meet personal circumstances must attract only very limited weight in support of the proposals, as would the use of energy efficient materials.
13. I have also concluded that the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers would be safeguarded. However, for the reasons as set out, any benefits of the proposed development would be insufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area and conflict with the Development Plan which I have identified.
14. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR