



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 6 October 2020

by Graham Wyatt BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3245240

44 Colombo Road, Ilford IG1 4RQ

- 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 Tufail Ahmed against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4421/19, dated 18 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a "single storey rear extension with a depth of 6 metres, highest point of 4 metres. The current single storey rear extension is lawfully completed at 3.5m in 2012 and the proposal is for the additional 2.5m to extend to 6m".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension with a depth of 6 metres, highest point of 4 metres. The current single storey rear extension is lawfully completed at 3.5m in 2012 and the proposal is for the additional 2.5m to extend to 6m at 44 Colombo Road, Ilford IG1 4RQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 4421/19, dated 18 November 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: Current Floor Plans and Elevations, Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations, Block Plan and Location Plan

Main Issue

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of adjoining occupiers with particular regard to outlook and sense of enclosure at 42 Colombo Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms an end of terrace property that is located within a predominantly residential area. The property benefits from an existing 3.5m single storey extension and proposes to add a further 2.5m to create a 6m extension. There is a variety in the way that properties in the vicinity of the appeal site have been extended, with some benefiting from larger single storey extensions while others have smaller lean examples.

4. I have noted that the Council consider that the proposal is not consistent with the guidance in the London Borough of Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (the SPD). The SPD is, however, guidance and not prescriptive. The policies in the London Borough of Redbridge Council Local Plan 2018 (the Local Plan) expect new development to have regard to its context. There are examples of other extensions that I saw which diverge from the guidance in the SPD and, whilst I accept that these may predate the guidance or may have been constructed under permitted development, they are nonetheless part of the context of the appeal building. The appellant also provided details of a number of properties that benefit from large extensions that have been developed along Colombo Road.
5. Consequently, having regard to Policy LP26 and LP30 of the Local Plan, the design and scale of the proposed additional single-storey extension would neither adversely affect or overwhelm the character of the host dwelling, nor be uncharacteristic in its extent compared to existing extensions within the wider area. Moreover, the neighbouring property at No. 42 benefits from an existing single storey extension which protrudes beyond the existing single storey extension at the appeal site. Although the proposal would change the layout so that the situation would be reversed, given the modest projection that would arise and the absence of a similar extension at No. 40, I am not persuaded that the proposal would affect the outlook afforded to the occupants of No. 42 to a significant degree.
6. Thus, although the proposed extension would exceed the rule of thumb figure set out in the SPD, for the reasons I have set out above, I am not persuaded that this renders it unacceptable. I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area, or the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. Therefore, it would accord with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Local Plan which seek, amongst other things, to ensure high quality design in all development by ensuring that proposals respect the local character of the area, make a positive architectural and urban design contribution to its context and location and does not result in adverse impact upon the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Conditions

7. I have considered the proposed conditions in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. Along with the standard time condition, the approved plans should also be specified to provide certainty. As the proposed plans indicate that the materials to be used in the construction of the development would match the existing dwelling, there is no requirement for a further condition to control such matters.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR