
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2020

by **J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3252255

44 Newbury Road, Newbury Park, ILFORD, IG2 7HD

- 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 M Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0674/20, dated 29 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the construction of a single-storey rear extension linking to an existing detached garage, and conversion of the garage into a habitable room (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single-storey rear extension linking to an existing detached garage, and conversion of the garage into a habitable room, at 44 Newbury Road, Newbury Park, ILFORD, IG2 7HD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 0674/20, dated 29 February 2020, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. The extension which is the subject of this appeal has already been constructed in its entirety. There is therefore no need for a time-limited condition or conditions relating to plans and materials.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effect of the extensions on:
 - The character and appearance of the area around Newbury Road, and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of No 42 Newbury Road by way of light and outlook.

Reasons

4. No 44 Newbury Road is an end-terraced house, situated on the southern side of the road. It is a two-storey house with a large rear dormer extension. At the time of my visit, the extensions that are the subject of this appeal had already been constructed. They take the form of a full-width, single-storey rear extension, that links to a further single-storey, side/rear extension. The rear extension is some 6 metres in depth and some 3 metres high, with a flat

roof. The smaller additional side/rear extension projects around 4.5 metres further back into the plot, and some 1.3 metres out from the side elevation of the main house.

5. It would appear that the extensions as built replace an earlier rear extension that was some 4 metres deep with a mono-pitch roof, and a separate detached garage, that was sited to the rear of the house in the rear garden, adjacent to the side boundary with No 46. Since the current extension is some 2 metres deeper than the earlier one, it now links with that part of the extension that effectively replaces the garage.

Character and appearance

6. The plots along Newbury Road and adjacent roads appear to be long, such that there are long rear gardens and a spacious feel to the area in general. Many of the houses in the vicinity of the appeal property have rear extensions of varying sizes and materials, including Nos 36 and 38 which appear to have long rear extensions using mixed materials. Also, a number of nearby houses have large dormer roof extensions. Nos 44 and 46 have rendered elevations.
7. Policy LP26 of the Council's Local Plan (LP) requires that development respects the local character of the area and consists of high-quality details and materials that respects or improves local character. Policy LP30 of the LP requires that householder development complements the character of the building, particularly in terms of scale, style, form and materials and is subordinate to the existing building in terms of size, scale or height.
8. In this case, the extension is only 2 metres longer than that existing previously, and the further side/rear extension would appear to be similar in scale to the earlier existing garage. There is a continuity of materials used in the extensions that would not appear to have existed previously, and the whole development has rendered elevations. From the street, the limited amount of the development that is visible appears neat and coherent. Moreover, the limited extra footprint involved with the construction of the extension would not seem excessive in this particular case, given the scale of the house and size of the plot.
9. On this issue, I conclude that the extension respects the character of the surrounding area in terms of scale and materials and that it appears subordinate to the main house. It would not, therefore, conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the LP, and would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area around Newbury Road.

Living conditions

10. Policy LP26 of the LP requires that development does not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in relation to overlooking and privacy, daylight, sunlight, or outlook. Policy LP30 requires that householder developments avoid adverse impacts on the sunlight/daylight received by neighbouring properties, and maintains an acceptable outlook from surrounding dwellings. In addition, the Council's Housing Design: Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) notes that it is important that single-storey rear extensions do not project too far into the garden from the original rear wall of the house. This is to avoid the extension being overbearing and causing a significant loss of outlook, light, or an increased sense of enclosure.

11. In this case, the earlier extension already projected some 4 metres from the rear elevation of the house. The rear elevations of the houses on this side of Newbury Road face south, and the distance between the rear elevations of houses on Newbury Road and those on the adjacent Church Road is considerable. I do not consider, in this case, that the additional 2 metres depth resulting from the construction of the current single-storey extension has any significantly detrimental impact on daylight or sunlight received at the rear of the adjoining No 42, which lies to the west of No 44.
12. Similarly, the length of the rear gardens here, and general openness of outlook, means that the view out from the rear of No 42 is not significantly impacted by the extension at No 44, particularly as there was a 4-metre long extension in place before the current extension was constructed. I do not consider that the extension is overbearing in this regard or results in any significant increase in the sense of enclosure.

Conclusion

13. I find that the extension as already constructed does not conflict with Policies LP26 or LP30 of the Council's LP, nor with relevant guidance in the Council's SPD, as they relate to issues of character and appearance and living conditions. Accordingly, I allow this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR