



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2020

**by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 25 November 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3248998**

**15 Cranbrook Rise, Cranbrook, Ilford, IG1 3QP**

- 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 Zulfaqr Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref: 4185/19, dated 27 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2019.
  - The development proposed is conversion of the existing garage and shed to create a residential annexe to the main building.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
  - whether the proposal would comply with development plan policies for the use of outbuildings, having regard to the effect on the character and appearance of the building and the streetscene, and
  - whether there would be sufficient internal floor space and outlook to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupants of the residential annexe.

## Preliminary Matter

3. In its decision notice the Council has described the proposal as "Use of detached rear garage/shed to a granny annexe for ancillary use to the main dwelling house. Two front and two rear roof lights (Summary)". However, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the applicant's description of development.

## Reasons

### *Proposed use*

4. Redbridge Local Plan policy LP7 indicates that the Council will resist the use of outbuildings ordinarily used for ancillary purposes within a dwelling curtilage or garden as separate sleeping and living accommodation. Paragraph 3.8.4 of the *Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document* indicates that the use of outbuildings must only be a use incidental to that of the main house. Any proposals which include primary living conditions will usually be refused permission.

5. The appellant advises that the proposal is not for separate sleeping and living accommodation and is willing to accept a condition restricting the use to an annexe. However, the submitted plans do not indicate how the floorspace would be used. The application was for a 'residential annexe' so its use for sleeping and living accommodation cannot be entirely ruled out.
6. The appeal building is a former garage with a shed to the rear. It adjoins a similar structure which serves a neighbouring property at No.2. St George's Road. The building has basic facilities of a toilet and sink but is in a poor condition internally. The proposal would retain the existing doorway providing access to the rear garden, and two small window openings. Further daylight would be gained through two roof lights at the front and rear elevations.
7. The building would retain a garage style door, with an internal wall to the rear of the garage door to prevent independent access. I consider that there would be minimal change to the appearance of the building. However, the proposed use of this small garage and shed fronting on to St George's Road would be out of character with the general form and pattern of residential development in the area. I find that the proposed use of the outbuilding would conflict with Local Plan policy LP7 and with guidance in the *Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document*.

#### *Effect on living conditions*

8. Local Plan policy LP29 sets amenity and internal space standards. The proposed residential annexe would only have 2 small windows in the elevation facing towards the rear elevation of the main house as well as a glazed door panel. I consider that this would provide an inadequate degree of outlook for any future occupants of the proposed annexe, and despite the proposed roof lights, would create an undue sense of enclosure.
9. The amount of internal floorspace to be used of around 28 m<sup>2</sup> would be inadequate as it would fall below the standard of 39 m<sup>2</sup> for a 1 person/1 bedroom unit, as stated in Table 5 of Local Plan policy LP29. I consider that it is reasonable to apply these standards to the proposed development. I find that the proposed residential annexe would have insufficient internal floor space and degree of outlook to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupants, contrary to Local Plan policy LP29.

#### **Other Matters**

10. The appellant considers that the proposal would result in the refurbishment and beneficial use of the building, leading to a visual enhancement of the locality. However, improvements to the building could be achieved by means other than the appeal proposal.

#### **Conclusion**

11. I have taken all other matters raised into account, including the sustainability and design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Martin H Seddon*

INSPECTOR