

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 November 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3255241

57 Wensleydale Avenue, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0NB

- 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 Dr Masroor Zaman against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1346/20, dated 9 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear glazed conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear glazed conservatory at 57 Wensleydale Avenue, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1346/20, dated 9 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PP/01, PP/02 and PP/03.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Applications for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Dr Masroor Zaman against the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is located in an urban residential location and is occupied by a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey extension to the rear. The surrounding area is largely comprised of other semi-detached dwellings, many of which have undergone side and rear extensions creating a varied appearance within the streetscene. The proposed development is a

conservatory to the rear of the dwelling, extending from the existing single storey rear extension. Due to the location of the proposal, there would be limited visibility from the public realm and therefore the proposed conservatory would have little impact on the overall character and appearance of the streetscene.

6. It is noted that the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2019 states that the depth for single storey rear extensions on a terrace property should generally be 3.5 metres. The proposal, along with the existing rear extension, would create an overall rear extension with a depth of 6 metres. It would also extend further into the rear garden than the adjoining neighbour's dwellings. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to this guidance.
7. The cumulative impact of the proposed development and existing extension would result in a large addition to the rear of the property with a significant depth. However, due to the design of the conservatory, it would appear as an entirely separate addition to the existing extension and not as one singular large form, reducing its impact on visual amenity. The conservatory is typical in design, relatively modest in size and the rear garden can sufficiently accommodate it. Therefore, the proposal would not appear overly large or bulky within its surroundings and would retain adequate amenity space within the property. Although it would not strictly accord with the guidance in the SPD, the design and scale of the proposed conservatory would not dominate the host dwelling and would appear as a subordinate addition to the property.
8. It is also recognised that a number of similar types of development have been undertaken within the vicinity of the appeal site including at 63 and 65 Wensleydale Avenue. Although these may not have been assessed against current policies or guidance and are not necessarily a prevalent feature in the locality, they do still form part of the character of the surrounding area. Therefore, due to the presence of similar development in the area and the domestic nature of the conservatory, the proposal would not appear out of character within the surrounding area or as an incongruous addition to the host property.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and would not be contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018). These seek to ensure new development is of a high-quality design which complements the character of the existing building in terms of scale, style, form and materials and is subordinate to the existing building.

Other Matters

10. Although not a reason for refusal, concerns regarding the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings have been raised in third party representations. These primarily relate to loss of outlook and privacy. The proposal would extend further into the rear garden than the extension at No.59, but by less than 3 metres, and due to the boundary fence and the single storey nature of the conservatory it would not appear particularly prominent or obtrusive over the fence or allow for overlooking to this adjoining property. It would project significantly further back than No. 55 but again the boundary fence, low height of the conservatory and, in this case, the set back from this boundary would avoid any overbearing impact or loss of privacy to

this neighbour. I therefore find, as per the Council's conclusions, that the conservatory would not have a significantly harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of either neighbouring dwelling.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty. As the plans include details of the materials to be used, it is not necessary to impose a separate condition stating this, as suggested by the Council.

Conclusions and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR