



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: 01 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3252229

121 Coventry Road, Ilford, IG1 4QT

- 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 F Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref: 3677/19, dated 18 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey 2 bedroom residential unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The height of the proposed residential unit would be around 5.2 m with a dual pitch roof. The appellant has advised that this proposed height is negotiable and can be brought down to 4 m. However, I must determine this appeal on the basis of the plans which were refused by the Council, as to do otherwise could prejudice the interests of the Council and any third parties who would not have been consulted on the matter.
3. The appellant has agreed to make a financial contribution to the Council as the site location is within 6.2 km of the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the effect on the living conditions of neighbours in respect of outlook;
 - whether the proposed residential unit would provide good quality living conditions for future occupiers;
 - the effect on highway and pedestrian safety, and
 - the effect on the protected Sycamore tree.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. No.121 Coventry Road is a detached dwelling located in a residential area at the junction of Coventry Road and Melbourne Road. Dwellings along this part of Coventry Road are either detached or semi-detached with long narrow rear gardens.
6. The proposed residential unit would be out of character with the pattern of development in this locality because of its siting in the rear garden of No.121 Coventry Road. The long rear gardens are generally verdant amenity areas with some tree cover and small outhouses. Together they provide a corridor of amenity space between the rear of the houses which line Coventry Road and Ingleby Road.
7. Houses in the area are generally set back from the adjacent road. The main elevation of the proposed unit would face, and be close to, Melbourne Road. There are single storey house extensions and garages in the vicinity. However, in view of its siting near to Melbourne Road, the proposed single storey unit would appear prominent and out of scale compared with the majority of dwellings in the surrounding area. I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Redbridge Local Plan policy LP26 which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that development respects the existing layout of buildings, surrounding streets, open spaces, and patterns of development.

Living conditions of neighbours

8. The proposed unit would be close to the rear garden boundary fence for Nos.119/119A Coventry Road. There is a timber outbuilding at the end of the garden. The proposed residential unit would appear overbearing from this rear garden because of its height, proximity, and length. It would create a sense of undue enclosure for neighbouring occupiers and would reduce their enjoyment of their rear garden. I find that the proposal would conflict with Local Plan policy LP26 concerning the need to avoid development resulting in an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in respect of outlook.

Living conditions of future occupiers

9. Local Plan policy LP29 sets amenity and internal space standards. The appellant advises that the amount of internal floorspace would be around 61.38 m². This would meet the minimum standard of 61 m² of floorspace for a 2 bed 3 person dwelling, as stated in Table 5 of Local Plan policy LP29. However, the amount of amenity space would only be around 28.75 m², much less than the minimum amount of 50 m² required by Local Plan policy LP29 and also Local Plan policy LP7. The amenity space would also be capable of being overlooked from the facing windows in the rear elevation of No.121 Coventry Road.
10. There would be no windows in the rear gable end wall of the proposed residential unit or side wall facing the garden of No.119/119A Coventry Road. The windows proposed in the main elevation facing Melbourne Road would be close to the rear of the footway and likely to lead to loss of privacy for future occupants of the building through overlooking from pedestrians and passing traffic, contrary to Local Plan policy LP26.

Effect on highway and pedestrian safety

11. The Council has advised that the site has a PTAL level of 4 on a scale of 1-6, where 6 is excellent. According to the London Plan the proposal would require up to 1-1.5 parking spaces. The appellant has advised that parking stress in the area is a consequence of factors including people parking from elsewhere in the area or as a result of families with more than one vehicle. The appellant has offered a shared parking space on the driveway of 121 Coventry Road to counter the Council's requirement. However, no legal agreement has been submitted to ensure availability of such a space at all times and into the future. In the absence of such a guarantee I find that the lack of parking space for future owners and their visitors would be likely to add to parking stress in the area and increase the potential for harm to highway and pedestrian safety, as drivers search for parking spaces in the locality. The proposal would therefore conflict with the parking requirements of Local Plan policy LP23 which seeks to ensure that new development provides sufficient car parking, having regard to standards in the London Plan.

Effect on protected tree

12. The foundations and rear elevation of the proposed building would be located close to a Sycamore tree that is protected by a Tree Preservation Order, and which contributes towards the visual amenity of the area. An Arboriculture Impact Statement and Tree Plan were submitted with the application. However, I consider that insufficient detail has been submitted, in accordance with the requirements of *British Standard BS 5837 (2012): "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction"* to clearly demonstrate that the proposal would cause no significant harm to the tree or its root zone. The proposal would therefore conflict with Local Plan policy LP38 which seeks to maintain tree coverage in the area.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has referred to several similar dwellings, both single and two storeys having been approved in walking distance of the appeal site. Three specific examples with plans have been provided in the statement of appeal. A two storey dwelling was allowed at No.2A Christchurch Road but that involved demolition of an existing workshop. The development of flats at No.8 Granville Road concerned the demolition of an existing two storey building. The dwelling approved at No.2 Valentine Road occupied a small area of land fronting the highway. The particular site circumstances for these developments and pattern of surrounding development differ from those at the appeal site. Therefore, I consider that these examples are insufficient reason to allow the appeal before me.

Conclusion

14. I have taken all other matters raised into account. However, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR