
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/D/20/3248774

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 Belyani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4055/19, dated 16 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor part rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor part rear extension at 75 Mayesbrook Road, Goodmayes, Ilford IG3 9PJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 4055/19, dated 16 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan #1259315, BM/0919/PL2, BM/0919/PL3, BM/0919/PL4, BM/0919/PL5, BM/0919/PL6, BM/0919/PL7 revised 23.04.2019, BM/0919/PL8.
 - 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.

Procedural Matters

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. I have also dealt with appeals for a new dwelling 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 the effect of the proposal on (i) the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

¹ Appeal reference APP/W5780/W/20/3249783

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

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling with an existing single-storey rear extension on Mayesbrook Road, close to the junction with Aberdour Road. Mayesbrook Road is characterised by semi-detached and terraced dwellings of mostly similar designs which are generally set on fairly strong building lines fronting the street. 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.
6. The proposed extension would have a width greater than half the width of the dwelling. In this regard, it would 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. Nevertheless, there would remain an appreciable set-in from the boundary with 79 Mayesbrook Road. The extension would also be of fairly modest depth, and the hipped roof form would be set down from the main roof ridge. Taken as a whole, I find that it would not therefore be disproportionate to the existing dwelling overall which the guidance in the SPD seeks to avoid.
7. The position of the extension to the rear of the dwelling and set down roof form would reduce its prominence in views from Mayesbrook Road, and there would be no change to the front of the building or the spacing to 73 Mayesbrook Road. Although more visible from the Orchard Playing Fields and allotments to the rear of the site and the access to these which runs to the side of the site, the visual impact and prominence of the development would be limited by the extension's subservient scale and the design and materials which would reflect those of the host dwelling.
8. Although not a common feature of the area, I observed a few first-floor extensions to dwellings on Mayesbrook Road which were visible from the street scene or the Orchard Playing Fields. I also noted some fairly large dormers to the rear of nearby dwellings which have visibly altered their form and scale at a high level, and which are visible from areas to the rear of the site. Given this context and that it would be proportionate to the host dwelling overall, I am satisfied that the extension would not be unsympathetic or incongruous.
9. For these reasons, I conclude on this main issue that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore accord 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.

Living Conditions

10. The Council's reason for refusal refers to the effect of the proposal on the occupiers of neighbouring properties, although its evidence does not specifically identify impacts or properties which are of concern.
11. The extension would be visible from surrounding properties and gardens. However, it would not impact on the ground floor rear windows to 77 Mayesbrook Road which are within a deeper projection. The modest depth of

the extension and set in from the boundary would also prevent loss of outlook from the first floor windows of this neighbour and avoid an undue sense of enclosure. These factors would similarly limit any loss of light to these windows, and in this regard I note that the proposal would also comply with the '45 Degree Rule' guidance which the SPD advises is used to assess the effect of development on neighbouring properties in terms of daylight and sunlight.

12. The dwellings at 79 and 81 Mayesbrook Road are orientated with their rear elevations facing towards single-storey extensions and gardens to the rear of No 77 and the appeal dwelling. The depth of the extension would not intrude on the main outlook from windows to their rear, and would additionally be screened in part from the ground floor windows by the existing extension to No 77. Although there would be oblique views of the extension, the separation distance to the boundaries of these neighbours would be sufficient to ensure that the development would not be overbearing or cause a loss of light or outlook.
13. Views from windows to the extension would be towards the open space to the rear, and would be comparable to those from the existing first floor windows so would not cause loss of privacy. Given the separation to 73 Mayesbrook Road, I am also satisfied that living conditions for occupiers of this dwelling would be maintained.
14. I therefore conclude on this main issue that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies LP26 or LP30 of the RLP which require, amongst other things, that the amenity of neighbouring occupiers is not adversely impacted. For the same reasons, I find no conflict with the guidance within the SPD which seeks to minimise the effect of extensions on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

15. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of certainty. A condition relating to external materials is also necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR