
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: 24 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3253086

2 Easternville Gardens, Newbury Park, ILFORD, IG2 6AB

- 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 Ramanathan Sriranjani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0207/20, dated 20 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the extension on:
 - The character and appearance of the area around Easternville Gardens, and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties on Quebec Road and Cranley Road by way of outlook.

Reasons

3. No 2 Easternville Gardens 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 and full-width, single-storey rear extension. There is a small attached garage to the side of the house. To the west of the appeal property lie the rear gardens of houses fronting Quebec Road. These houses are set at a slight angle to the plot of the appeal property, such that its rear garden widens towards the rear of the plot. The existing garage follows the angled line of the boundary between the appeal property and the houses on Quebec Road and it is, therefore, irregular in shape.
4. The proposed side extension would be two-storey and would extend along the side of the house to a point some 3 metres beyond the existing main rear elevation of the house at first-floor level, and around 3.5 metres at ground-floor level. It would be set some 0.3 metres below the existing ridge level of the main roof and would have both sloping and flat roofed elements. It would be set against the angled side boundary for a small distance and would then turn away from the boundary to continue the direction of the existing side elevation of the house. As such it would effectively slope away from the rear

elevations of the houses on Quebec Road from this point. It would have a maximum width of around 3 metres at the rear. The proposal would also involve an extension to the existing front porch.

Character and appearance

5. 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.
6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Housing Design (SPD) indicates that, in the case of two-storey side extensions, the overall scale of two-storey side extensions should be proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions and scale of the host property. Moreover, the depth of the two-storey side extension should not exceed the depth of the side elevation of the host property, and the ridge of the extension should be set down no less than 0.5m from the height of the main ridge, to ensure that the extension appears subordinate to the host property.
7. In this case, the surrounding area is characterised by relatively small terraced houses. Many have single-storey rear extensions, and some have dormer extensions. However, it would not appear that there are any large two-storey side or rear extensions in the vicinity of the appeal property. The two-storey extension would exceed the depth of the side elevation of the host property by around 3 metres, such that it would result in a large expanse of blank wall, much of it along the plot boundary, which would be prominent in the street scene. The roof line would be only a small amount below that of the main ridge, and the roof profile would appear complex and awkward. In the context of the area, it would not appear subordinate to the existing house, and it would be out of character with the general scale of the surrounding properties.
8. The extension to the front porch would leave little room for a window to the proposed reception room in the side extension. This window, serving a habitable room, would be very small and would appear cramped and out of character with the rest of the ground-floor windows. Whilst this is a relatively minor issue, it adds to my concerns over the appearance of the proposed extension within the streetscape.
9. The Council makes reference to the appeal property as occupying a corner plot, in which case the proposed extension should be set in 1 metre from the side boundary. I disagree, in that the relevant corner plot is occupied by No 126 Quebec Road. Nevertheless, the overall scale of the proposed extension, and in particular its length and height, along with the complexity of its proposed roof profile, would result in harm to the prevailing character and appearance of the area surrounding Easternville Gardens.
10. On this issue, therefore, I conclude that the extension would not respect the character of the surrounding area in terms of scale, and that it would not appear subordinate to the main house. It would, therefore, conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the LP, and with guidance in the SPD, and it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Easternville Gardens.

Living conditions

11. 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.
12. The plots along Easternville Gardens, Quebec Road and Cranley Road are long, such that there are long rear gardens and a generally spacious and open feel to the area. The proposed extension would be around 20 metres from the rear elevation of the nearest houses on Quebec Road and, by virtue of its limited width, would have little impact on the outlook from those houses or from the rear of houses further away on Cranley Road. From this perspective, I do not consider that the extension would be overbearing or result in any significant increase in the sense of enclosure.
13. On this issue, therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not be significantly harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties by way of outlook, and it would not conflict with Policies LP26 or LP30 of the LP.

Conclusion

14. I find that the extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Council's LP. I do not consider that it would be significantly harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings by way of outlook, but this lack of significant harm does not compensate for the harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR