



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3246004

116 Goodmayes Lane, Goodmayes, Ilford IG3 9PX

- 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 M Mattu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4543/19, dated 26 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the:
 - character and appearance of the area, including the host property;
 - living conditions of the occupiers of the host dwelling with particular regard to external amenity space; and,
 - living conditions of adjoining occupiers with particular regard to outlook from 118 Goodmayes Lane.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site forms a detached two storey dwelling that benefits from an existing rear extension and a single storey outbuilding in the rear of the garden, which covers the width of the plot. The area is predominantly residential in character and contains a variety of style and size of dwellings. On the whole, dwellings are set back from the road with decent sized rear private gardens along with parking areas to the front, which lends the area an open and spacious character.
4. The proposal seeks to erect a single storey extension with a depth of 4m that would leave a gap of some 2.85m from the northern flank elevation. The proposal to add a further 4m extension onto the building, coupled with the existing rear extension and outbuilding, would result in a lack of space about the building and is indicative of the overdevelopment of a site. The proposal would extend the overall bulk of the building into the rear garden area and would appear as a cramped and discordant development, out of keeping with the more open and spacious character that exists in the area. Moreover, the reduction in the rear garden for the property would further erode the spaciousness of the site.

5. Thus, the development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area and the host property. It would be in conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the London Borough of Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (the Local Plan) and the SPD, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments respect the local character of an area and complements the character of the building, particularly in terms of scale.

Living Conditions of Occupiers of Host Property

6. Policy LP29 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that developments provide adequate external amenity space to meet the needs of occupants, which the Council has been unable to assess as the submitted plans do not show the entire garden area. Moreover, the appellant has also failed to adequately demonstrate that the remaining external amenity space would comply with the requirements of Policy LP29 of the Local Plan. Therefore, in the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, the proposal would fail to provide adequate external amenity space that would be available to occupiers of the dwelling, thereby undermining their living conditions.
7. Thus, the development would result in material harm to the living conditions of the host property by failing to provide adequate external amenity space. It would be in conflict with Policy LP29 of the Local Plan, the requirements of which is specified above.

Living Conditions of Adjoining Occupiers

8. The proposed extension would be erected adjacent to the shared boundary with No. 118 Goodmayes Lane (No. 118). The extension would nonetheless be set in from the flank elevation of the host property and would be single storey in height. Given the separation distance and the intervening fence, I am satisfied that the development would not significantly affect the neighbouring living conditions at No. 118 in terms of outlook. Furthermore, the space that would exist between the properties post development would also ensure that a sense of enclosure does not occur.
9. Thus, the development would not be in conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Local Plan which seek, amongst other things, that developments avoid adverse impacts on the amenities of adjoining occupiers in relation to outlook.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is dismissed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR