



Appeal Decision

by **M Seaton DipTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 24 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3241310

22 Wensleydale Avenue, Clayhall, Ilford, IG5 0NA

- 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 Mrs Hafiza Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2880/19, dated 4 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension. Part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension. Part first floor rear extension at 22 Wensleydale Avenue, Clayhall, Ilford, IG5 0NA, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2880/19 dated 4 July 2019, and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. GLA-01L, GLA-02L, GLA-03L, GLA-04L & GLA-05L.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. In response to travel restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic, I consider that this appeal can be determined without the need for a physical site visit. This is because I have been able to reach a decision based on the information already available, supplemented by additional evidence supplied by the appellant and confirmed as being accurate by the Council.
3. Both the appellant and the Council have agreed to the appeal proceeding on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is occupied by an extended two-storey semi-detached property set back from the road behind an area of hardstanding utilised for off-street parking. The site is located within a predominantly residential area.
6. The proposals comprise both single storey and first floor rear extensions. The Council has indicated that the width and depth of the first-floor rear extension would be acceptable, and whilst a flat roof extension would not usually be appropriate, in this instance it would appear consistent with the flat roof of the existing two-storey side extension. Having reviewed the submitted plans and photographs, I have no reason to disagree with these conclusions and I am satisfied that the proposed first floor extension would not result in any adverse visual impact.
7. Turning to the single-storey rear extension, the Council has expressed concern over the 5-metre depth of the proposed single-storey as being excessive, citing guidance set out within the Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) adopted September 2019. The SPD indicates that single-storey extensions should generally be kept to a maximum depth of 3.5 metres, ensuring that they do not dominate the host property, and avoid 'creep' beyond the depth of extensions of adjoining neighbours.
8. The full-width extension would clearly exceed the maximum depth of 3-3.5 metres advised within the SPD and would conflict with the guidance in this respect. The extension would also exceed the depth of the existing extension at No. 20 Wensleydale Avenue, which the Council indicates to be 4 metres in length but without the benefit of planning permission or any other form of approval.
9. However, No. 24 Wensleydale Avenue has recently been granted prior approval for an extension of 6 metres depth, with the submitted photographs and evidence available on publicly accessible mapping software clearly demonstrating that these works have now been implemented. It is therefore the case that whilst the appeal proposals would exceed the guided maximum depth of extension within the SPD, the resultant depth would not result in 'creep' beyond the depth of neighbouring extensions. Furthermore, the design of the proposed single-storey extension, even when assessed cumulatively with the existing and other proposed extensions to the property, would neither adversely affect or overwhelm the character of the host dwelling, nor be uncharacteristic in their extent compared to existing extensions within the wider area.
10. For these reasons, the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or area. The proposal would not conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted March 2018 (the Local Plan), or 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.

Other Matters

11. I have had regard to a concern raised by an interested party that the property is currently being operated as an unlicensed House in Multiple Occupation. However, whether or not this is the case is not formally before me with the proposal applied for as an extension to an existing dwelling, and it is on this basis that the appeal has been determined.
12. The occupier of No.24 Wensleydale Avenue has expressed concern that the proposals should not extend beyond the depth of the existing neighbouring extensions, particularly at first floor level, in order to ensure there would not be an adverse impact on living conditions having regard to light and privacy. In this regard it is evident that the proposed extensions would not exceed the depth of their respective neighbouring counterparts and would not therefore give rise to the stated concerns.
13. I have also had regard to further considerations raised by the neighbouring occupier regarding matters related to access on to the neighbouring land during the construction period, a party-wall agreement and appropriate public liability insurance, along with the maintenance of access to the neighbouring front drive. However, these are private matters and not of relevance to the planning merits of the proposed development and have not therefore had any bearing on my decision-making.

Conditions

14. The Council has suggested the imposition of conditions within their appeal submissions. In addition to conditions regarding timeliness and adherence to the submitted plans, I am satisfied that a condition securing the use of matching materials would be reasonable in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given, and subject to the conditions as set out, the appeal is allowed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR