

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/20/3248756

75 and 77 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 Belyani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4106/19, dated 21 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the appellant's name as it was stated on the application form and appeal form in the banner heading above.
3. The Council's second reason for refusal referred to the effect of the proposal on outlook from 81 Mayesbrook Road. At appeal stage, the Council has confirmed that this was an error and that the concern relates to 79 Mayesbrook Road. The appellant's evidence considers the effect on both No 79 and No 81, and the appellant also had an opportunity to comment on the Council's evidence. I am therefore satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by my consideration of the appeal on this basis, and I have determined the appeal accordingly.
4. I have also dealt with appeals for a first floor rear extension to 75 Mayesbrook Road¹ and for a new dwelling on the site of 75 Mayesbrook Road². Those appeals are the subject of separate decisions.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area; and (ii) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 79 Mayesbrook Road with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal site includes a pair of semi-detached dwellings located on Mayesbrook Road close to the junction with Aberdour Road. Mayesbrook Road

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

² Appeal reference APP/W5780/W/20/3249783

is characterised by semi-detached and terraced dwellings of mostly similar designs which are generally set on fairly strong building lines fronting the street. I saw a few examples of roof alterations and dormer windows, but extensions to dwellings are for the most part at single-storey level which restricts their prominence in views from Mayesbrook Road. As a result, there is a strong sense of uniformity in the street scene which is reinforced by the common exterior materials of pebbledash render and facing brick.

7. Both dwellings on the site have existing single-storey rear extensions. The appeal proposes a first-floor rear extension which would span the whole width of 75 Mayesbrook Road and the closest part of the rear of 77 Mayesbrook Road. Given the modest width, depth and height of the extension to the rear of No 77, I see no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment that it would appear subordinate to the host dwelling.
8. The extension to the rear of No 75 would be of the same depth, but would extend across the full width of the host dwelling, and would be of comparable height to its main roof. Despite the use of matching materials and the hipped roof design which would reflect the appeal property and other buildings nearby, the resulting bulk and mass of the extension would be significant and disproportionate against the host dwelling, dominating its rear elevation. The lack of openings or other visual relief to the side of the extension adjacent to the access to Orchard Playing Fields and the allotments to the rear of the site would further emphasise its bulk, exacerbating the visual impact.
9. The site is in a fairly prominent location, and the development would be plainly visible from the open spaces to the rear of the site, as well as from the access to these and the Mayesbrook Road street scene. In these views, the disproportionate extension would unacceptably diminish the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and consequently the area generally.
10. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (RLP) which, amongst other things, require high quality design which broadly respects or enhances local character and which is well-integrated with its surroundings. It would also be contrary to guidance within the Council's Housing Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD) which advises that first-floor rear extensions should generally be no more than half the width of the original rear elevation to ensure they are proportionate and subordinate to the host property.

Living Conditions

11. Adjacent to the site, 79 Mayesbrook Road is orientated with its rear elevation facing towards the single-storey extensions to the appeal dwellings and their rear gardens. The development would be fairly close to the boundary with this neighbour, and would be visible from the windows and garden to its rear. However, given the set in from the side of the existing ground floor, it would be screened in part from the neighbouring ground floor windows. Remaining views and those from the upper floor would be oblique. The depth of the extension would not impose on the main outlook for windows, with significant open aspect across the appeal site retained to its rear. The hipped roof of the closest part of the extension would additionally be of limited height, reducing the mass and visual bulk of the development when seen from No 79, and there would be

greater separation to the development at the rear of No 75 which would be of increased height. These factors would together be sufficient to ensure that the development would not be overbearing or result in a significant loss of outlook from the neighbouring building or garden.

12. In conclusion on this main issue, I find that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of occupiers of 79 Mayesbrook Road. Accordingly, I find no conflict in this regard with RLP Policies LP26 or LP30 which require, amongst other things, that development does not impact adversely on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. For the same reasons, I find no conflict with the guidance within the SPD which also seeks to minimise the effect of extensions on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

13. I have taken into account matters raised by interested parties including comments regarding the condition of one of the existing properties on the appeal site, the effect of the proposal on existing tenants, and potential future occupiers. However, none of the matters raised either individually or collectively alter my conclusions on the main issues.

Conclusion

14. Notwithstanding my findings with regard to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and 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