



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2020

by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3244427

21 Dawlish Drive, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9ED

- 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 Alfredo Jara against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2948/19, dated 28 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a roof to allow space to be used for barbecues during the raining season.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning approval is granted for a rear covered structure at 21 Dawlish Drive, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9ED in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2948/19, dated 28 June 2019, and the roof and truss details; elevations; section of foundation; foundation plans, location plan and the site plan to show the exact location of the structure submitted with the application, and subject to the following condition:

(1) The use of the building hereby permitted shall remain incidental and to the primary use of the site/premises as a dwellinghouse.

Procedural Matter

2. The structure has already been erected on the site.
3. While the appellant describes the development as 'a roof to allow space to be used for barbecues during the raining season' I was able to see on my site visit that it is being used for other domestic purposes. I have therefore determined the application based on the description used by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) in its decision notice for 'a rear covered structure'.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reason

Character and appearance

5. Dawlish Drive includes terraced, two storey dwellings with pitched roofs and where most have two storey high bays with pitched roofs to their front

elevations. Views of their rear amenity spaces from Dawlish Drive are largely absent, and this is the case regarding the appeal site.

6. The rear amenity spaces, including that of the appeal site, are long. To the rear is a grassed sports ground which is not open to the public. Views of the appeal site are not visible from this land because of an intervening thick, mature hedge. The rear space of the appeal building is not visible from any public vantage point.
7. The appeal structure is approximately halfway along the length of the rear space and extends over its full width to its boundaries with numbers 19 and 23 Dawlish Drive. It is approximately 8.5 metres wide and 7.4 metres deep, with a height to the eaves of about 2.5 metres and 4.5 metres to the ridge. The structure is supported on pillars and most of the sides are open.
8. On my site visit, I was able to see that there are other outbuildings sited in the rear amenity spaces of adjoining properties. While the majority of these are smaller, the appeal building is not the only one of comparable size and height. Moreover, some such buildings are sited at least as far away from their respective dwellings as is the appeal building. A significant part of the rear space to the appeal property remains as open garden land and this retains the general openness of the rear amenity spaces in the immediate area.
9. The LPA has referred to an appeal dismissal relating to a large outbuilding at 63 Rochford Avenue.¹ However, that appeal relates to another part of the Borough and the proposal was assessed on the basis of the circumstances and characteristics of the locality concerned. I have determined the appeal based upon the characteristics and appearance of the immediate locality.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal development does not have a significantly adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area. It accords with policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (LP) which seek to ensure that development is of high design quality and is sympathetic to the character of its surroundings in terms of layout, form, style and massing. It would accord with the Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD) which requires that outbuildings do not impact upon the open character of garden areas and are subordinate to the original dwelling. It requires regard to be given to the prevailing character of outbuildings in the locality, and while these are generally for smaller buildings there is at least one similarly sized building in the immediate vicinity.

Condition

11. I have felt it necessary to impose a condition to ensure that the development remains incidental to the primary use of the site as a dwelling house.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/W5780/D/19/3223791