
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2020

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3249783

75 Mayesbrook Road, Goodmayes, Ilford IG3 9PJ

- 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 Belyani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4526/19, dated 24 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is subdivision of site and erection of a single storey detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. Nevertheless, I note that the Council altered the description of the application to 'one 1x bedroom dwelling house with associated cycle, waste / refuse and amenity space' which is also the description used by the appellant on the appeal form.
3. I have also dealt with appeals for a first floor rear extension on the same site¹, and for a first floor rear extension at 75 and 77 Mayesbrook Road². Those appeals are the subject of separate decisions.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) the effect of the proposal on the safe and efficient operation of the highway network in the vicinity of the appeal site with particular regard to provision for parking.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. Mayesbrook Road is a residential street characterised by two-storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings of mostly similar scale, materials and designs including hipped roofs and consistent patterns of fenestration. Dwellings are generally positioned on steady lines set back from the street, with backdrops of fairly long rear gardens apparent in views between buildings.

¹ Appeal reference APP/W5780/W/20/3248774

² Appeal reference APP/W5780/W/20/3248756

This provides a setting for the dwellings and a degree of spaciousness, and together with the overall uniformity in the appearance of the buildings, there is an attractive regularity and sense of harmony in the street scene.

6. The appeal proposes a detached dwelling on land between the side of 75 Mayesbrook Road and the adjacent access to the Orchard Playing Fields. The dwelling would be on a similar building line to No 75, but would be single-storey and would be much narrower. The hipped roof to the front of the dwelling would be below the eaves of the roofs to the adjacent dwellings, and its eaves would also be lower than the single-storey extension to No 75. Although the appellant comments that it would be subservient, the small-scale of the dwelling would be strikingly at odds with the characteristic two-storey buildings along Mayesbrook Road, and I saw no other examples of similar development in the area.
7. Moreover, the dwelling would be positioned on the boundary with the access to the Playing Fields, and very close to the side of No 75. This would deprive the dwelling of a proper setting, and together with the small size of the plot which would narrow significantly towards the rear, would cause the development to appear cramped and out of keeping with the more spacious setting of nearby dwellings.
8. Notwithstanding the suggested use of materials to complement the surrounding area, the uncharacteristic nature of the development would be further exacerbated by the roof design. The angle of the hipped roof section would contrast with the slopes of the main roofs of nearby buildings, and while the flat roof to the rear part of the dwelling would reflect the design of other extensions apparent in the area, it would make up nearly half of the depth of the dwelling. Against the single-storey scale of the dwelling, the rear projection would be disproportionate and a jarring feature.
9. The site and neighbouring areas are not identified as heritage assets, but the site is in a fairly prominent location opposite the entrance to Goodmayes Park. The development would be plainly visible from this entrance and the street scene, as well as from open spaces to the rear of the site and the adjacent access where it would stand out against the surrounding built form.
10. For these reasons, the development would be a prominent and wholly incongruous feature which would disrupt the rhythm of the street scene and cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (RLP) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011 (LP). Amongst other things, these policies broadly seek high quality design and development which respects or enhances local character and which is well-integrated with its surroundings.

Parking

11. RLP Policy LP23 advises that the Council will ensure sufficient car parking for development, and that where provision below standards within the LP is proposed, this will be considered on the basis of Transport Assessment, levels of public transport accessibility and the availability of public on-street parking.
12. No parking would be provided for the proposed dwelling, and the development would also result in the loss of the existing parking space to the side of

75 Mayesbrook Road. The Council advise that the site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 1b. This indicates very poor accessibility, and a likely reliance by occupiers of the site on travel by private vehicles, resulting in a likely requirement for parking which would not be met on the site.

13. The appellant has not provided a Transport Assessment or detailed information on parking availability. However, while parking on Mayesbrook Road is in part within marked bays on the footway, at the time of my visit a number of spaces were available along both Mayesbrook Road and on Aberdour Road very close to the site where I saw parking taking place without resulting in apparent obstruction to the highway. While this was during the day, I saw no parking restrictions in place nearby which would point to a high degree of parking stress, and there is no clear evidence before me of an existing local parking problem, or that the proposal would make any issues worse.
14. Notwithstanding the shortfall in parking on the site, I see no reason given these circumstances that the proposal would lead to unacceptable pressure for on-street parking or resulting adverse impacts on the safety or operation of the highway. In the absence of substantive evidence to the contrary, I therefore conclude that parking provision would be adequate. Accordingly, I find no conflict with RLP Policy LP23 or Policy 6.13 of the LP which together seek adequate provision for parking to meet the needs of development.

Other Matters

15. The RLP and LP identify a requirement for housing in the borough and indicate that proposals should make optimal use of sites. The development would contribute an additional dwelling to the supply of housing within the borough, and would make effective use of the site which is in an existing residential area in accordance with these objectives. There would also be some further short-term economic benefits during the construction period as well as support for the local economy by future occupiers, and associated social benefits to the community. However, these benefits would be limited by the small scale of the development, and I find that they would not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified would be caused to the area's character and appearance. That the internal area of the dwelling would meet relevant standards is a neutral factor which weighs neither for nor against the proposal.
16. The Council indicates that the site is 6.2km from the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The SAC is protected as a European Site of Nature Conservation Importance and is subject to statutory protection under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Regulations). The Regulations impose a duty on the competent authority to consider whether a proposal may have a significant effect on the conservation objectives of such sites either alone, or in combination with other plans and projects within the framework of an Appropriate Assessment (AA).
17. Although the Council's report on the application suggested the development would be exempt, at appeal stage, the Council advises that a financial contribution would be required to mitigate the effects of the proposal on the SAC. Had I concluded that the development would be acceptable in terms of the main issues, I would have found it necessary to investigate the effect of the proposal on the integrity of the SAC, and any suggested mitigation in greater detail as part of my AA. However, given the harm identified above and that I

am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I have not pursued this matter further as it could not be determinative.

18. The Council's evidence also raises concern in relation to levels of outlook and light within the proposed dwelling, and I note the depth of the proposed kitchen/dining/lounge area. However, I am mindful that this was not a reason for refusal of the application and as a result has not been addressed by the appellant as part of this appeal. With this in mind, I confirm that the harm that would arise in relation to the main issues in this case provide compelling grounds to dismiss the appeal.

Conclusion

19. Notwithstanding my findings with regard to the parking arrangements, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and there are no material considerations which indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR