



Appeal Decision

by **M Seaton DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3246724

47 Mossford Lane, Barkingside, Ilford, IG6 2JA

- 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 Nicola Thorpe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4455/19, dated 19 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and loft conversion with rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and loft conversion with rooflights at 47 Mossford Lane, Barkingside, Ilford, IG6 2JA, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 4455/19 dated 19 November 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. 01 (Location and Site Plans), 02 (Proposed Site Plan), 03 (Existing Floor Plans), 04 (Existing Elevations), 05 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan), 06 (Proposed First Floor Plan), 07 (Proposed Second Floor Plan), 08 (Proposed Roof Plan and Stair Detail), 09 (Proposed Elevations and Section) & 10 (Proposed Elevations), all dated as November 2019.
 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.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mrs Nicola Thorpe against the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matter

3. 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.

4. Both the appellant and the Council have agreed to the appeal proceeding on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. 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.
7. The proposals comprise both a single storey rear extension and a loft conversion which would incorporate pairs of rooflights within the front and rear roof slopes, and a single rooflight within the side roof-slope. The Council has indicated that the proposed loft conversion and rooflights would be visually acceptable, and having reviewed the submitted plans and photographs, I have no reason to disagree with these conclusions. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed loft conversion and rooflights would not result in any adverse visual impact.
8. Turning to the single-storey rear extension, the Council has expressed concern over this aspect of the proposal due to its depth and in the context of existing extensions to other properties in the area, the impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and area. In reaching this conclusion, the Council has cited 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.
9. The proposal is shown as extending to a depth of 4.5 metres over 6.46 metres of its width, with the 1.7 metres closest to the boundary with No. 45 Mossford Lane being set at a maximum of 3.5 metres depth. However, in assessing the impact of the proposal, I have had particular regard to the recent approval of planning permission (*LPA Ref: 4873/18*) in October 2019 for a single storey rear extension at the property, which remains extant and capable of implementation.
10. In the 2019 planning permission, the total depth of extensions from the main rear elevation of the dwelling was indicated on the approved plans to be 3.5 metres on the boundary with No. 45 Mossford Lane, with the remainder extending 4.2 metres from the main rear elevation. In effect, the appeal proposal would only exceed the depth of the previous approved scheme by 0.3 metres.
11. In the context of the SPD, I accept that the proposed extension would in part exceed the maximum depth of 3.5 metres and that neither of the neighbouring properties would appear to have previously been extended towards the rear. The proposal would therefore conflict with the guidance in this respect. However, in light of the valid fallback position, I am not persuaded that the

Council's conclusions regarding the adversity of the proposals are justified in light of the limited additional depth of the extension. I do not consider that the scale of the proposed extension would overwhelm or dominate the host dwelling and I note from available online mapping resources that there is clear evidence of other larger rear extensions within the wider area.

12. I have also noted that an approval (*LPA Ref: 4347/19*) was given in December 2019 under the prior approval procedure for a single storey extension of 4.5 metre depth, but with an overall reduced width. Whilst the overall form and scale of the extension and mechanism for assessment differed from that of the October 2019 planning permission, it would also present a further valid fallback position from which the appeal proposals should have been assessed, albeit that I find for the purposes of the assessment of this appeal that the October 2019 planning permission presents the more compelling position.
13. For these reasons, the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or area. Whilst I have highlighted there to be some conflict with the SPD, the proposal would accord with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, adopted March 2018, and Policy 7.4 of The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations since 2011 (2016). 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.

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