
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: 02 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3251143
82A Tomswood Hill, ILFORD, IG6 2QQ

- 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 T Jeyaraja against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0299/20, dated 28 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single-storey side/rear extension with a part first-floor rear 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 Tomswood Hill, and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of No 80 Tomswood Hill by way of outlook.

Reasons

3. No 82A Tomswood Hill is detached house, situated on the eastern side of the road. It is a two-storey house with a single-storey rear extension. No 82A and the houses to the north of it are set back further from the road than the neighbouring No 80 to the south. The boundary between the appeal property and No 80 is set at an angle to the house, as is its boundary with the rear garden at No 82. For this reason, the rear garden of No 82A runs at an angle to the orientation of the house, such that it runs across the rear garden of No 80, which, in turn, narrows towards the rear.
4. The proposed single-storey side/rear extension would project out from the side of the house in two steps, each around 1 metre in width. The first step would be around 3.2 metres in depth, and the second step would be some 2.7 metres in depth. The combined side/rear extension would be around 6 metres wide at its widest point and, to the rear, it would project some 2.5 metres beyond the existing rear extension. The first-floor extension would continue the line of the existing side elevation of the house and would be set above part of the proposed ground-floor extension, with an overall depth of around 3 metres.

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) provides some advisory maximum depths and widths for side and rear extensions. The SPD also indicates that the side wall of the extension should be made parallel to the original house and should not follow the line of a shared boundary where the boundary is set at an angle – as is the case with the boundary between Nos 80 and 82A. In such circumstances, the side wall of the extension should instead be staggered or stepped.
7. In this case, the proposed extensions would appear to meet the maximum width and depth allowances outlined in the SPD for side and rear extensions to a detached house, at both ground-floor and first-floor levels. Furthermore, the side elevations of the extension would be stepped out in line with the requirements of the SPD for angled boundaries. It would be set only around 2.5 metres beyond the existing ground-floor extension, and the first-floor element would be modest in size compared with the scale of the main house. In terms of scale, style, form and materials, therefore, I consider that it would respect the context of the existing house, and it would appear subordinate to the existing building in terms of size, scale and height.
8. On this issue, therefore, I conclude that the extension would respect the character of the host property and the surrounding area in terms of scale, style, form and materials, and that it would appear subordinate to the main house. It would, therefore, not conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the LP, or with guidance in the SPD, and it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Tomswood Hill.

Living conditions

9. Policy LP26 of the LP requires that development does not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in relation to outlook. Policy LP30 requires that householder developments avoid adverse impacts on the sunlight/daylight received by neighbouring properties, and maintain an acceptable outlook from surrounding dwellings.
10. In this case, by virtue of its stepped design remaining close to the angled boundary, the proposed side extension would effectively begin to wrap around the rear elevation of No 80. It would, on this basis, impinge upon the outlook from the rear of No 80. I consider that this would be oppressive in nature, especially as the extensions would project a considerable distance beyond the rear elevation of No 80. Moreover, since the rear garden of No 80 reduces significantly in width towards the rear of the plot, the stepped side extension would create a sense of enclosure and result in a harmful impact on the outlook from No 80. On this issue, therefore, I conclude that the proposal would be significantly harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties by way of outlook, and it would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the LP.

Other Matter

11. The appellant contends that the side extension could be built up to the boundary under permitted development (PD) standards. However, in this case, the side extension would be part of a combined side/rear extension that would be significantly greater than half the width of the original house, in which case it would not meet PD standards.

Conclusion

12. I find that the extension would be significantly harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 80 Tomswood Road by way of outlook, and would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Council's LP. I do not consider that it would be harmful to the character or appearance of the surrounding area, but this lack of harm does not compensate for the harm that would be caused to the residential amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring property. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR