



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 July 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3241159

118 Grange Road, Ilford IG1 1EY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Gareth Lewis against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 3578/19, dated 10 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with a depth of 4.7 metres, highest point of 3.2 metres and height at the eaves of 3 metres.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for a single storey rear extension with a depth of 4.7 metres, highest point of 3.2 metres and height at the eaves of 3 metres at 118 Grange Road, Ilford, IG1 1EY in accordance with the application Ref 3578/19 made on 10 September 2019, and the details submitted with it, including plan nos. A107, A125, A150, A350 Rev A and 1482-A100, pursuant to Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.4(2).

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used in the header above is based on that used on the Council's decision notice and it is not disputed by the appellant.

Appeal Procedure

3. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Part A.4(7) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development on the basis of its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises, where any adjoining occupier objects to the development. As an adjoining neighbour objected to the application, the Council assessed the impact of the proposal and found it unacceptable.

5. Based on the Council's decision notice, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 120 Grange Road with regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, mid-terrace property located on the southern side of Grange Road within an established residential area. The appeal property features an original Victorian rear outrigger and a dilapidated corrugated roofed lean-to which abuts the common boundary with 120 Grange Road.
7. The proposal would result in the demolition of the existing outrigger and lean-to and the subsequent erection of a single storey flat-roofed rear extension with a depth of 4.7 metres, a width of 5.5 metres, and a height of 3.2 metres. I note the extension would be slightly deeper and taller, in part, than the existing structures and would be slightly inset from the boundary with No.120.
8. As the rear outlook of the properties along this terrace is south-facing, No.120 may experience a slight reduction in light penetration during the afternoon due to the increase in height and depth of the proposal compared to the existing structures. This would mostly affect the closest window to the boundary which serves a utility room but also the sitting room window which is slightly further away. Nonetheless, in light of the relatively modest flat-roofed single storey height of the proposed development, I consider that the resultant overshadowing would constitute a minimal loss of light to the rear of No.120 and it would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers.
9. Furthermore, the development would not appear excessively obtrusive or bulky when seen from the ground floor rear elevation and garden of No.120. I find it would not have an adverse visual impact when seen from the neighbouring property given its simple design and the existing unsightly dilapidated lean-to which abuts the common boundary. In my view, the proposal would not drastically or negatively alter the outlook from the rear of No.120 nor, due to its modest scale, would it lead to an increased sense of enclosure. For these reasons I consider that the outlook from No. 120's rear elevation, kitchen side window and garden would not be unreasonably affected. The neighbouring property would still enjoy open rear views towards the south, overlooking generous garden space.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not adversely impact on the living conditions of the occupants of 120 Grange Road with regards to outlook and light. It would therefore accord with the guidance set out in paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires developments to ensure a high standard of amenity.

Other Matters

11. I note the neighbour's comments with regard to the inaccuracies of the plans and the height of the existing structures, however notwithstanding this, this has not prevented me from assessing the impact of the proposal fully.
12. I have also had regard to the neighbour's comments regarding works encroaching onto her property and on the underground pipework within the party wall area, but any issues of this nature can be addressed under different legislation.

Conditions

13. Although the Council have suggested conditions specifying the approved plans and requiring the construction materials match the existing building, any planning permission granted under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A is subject to the conditions in sections A.3 and A.4. This includes the requirement for the exterior materials to be similar to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse. In addition, the formal decision includes within it reference to the approved plans.

Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR