
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 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: 17 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3255939

22 Eastwood Road, South Woodford, London E18 1BW

- 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 George Mantzouridis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1126/20, dated 14 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey wrap around extension with a partial first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the adjoining property and surrounding area,
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 20 Eastwood Road, in relation to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with a two-storey outrigger to the rear along with two smaller single storey projections. It is located within a residential environment where the surrounding properties are largely semi-detached, brick built and traditional in appearance. The dwellings on the northern side of Eastwood Road are largely unaltered at first floor level giving a traditional and rhythmic appearance. There are several single storey rear extensions, however these are generally modest in size and have little impact on the overall appearance of these properties.

5. The proposal includes a two-storey rear extension projecting from the existing two-storey outrigger and a wraparound single storey rear extension. The Council have not expressed any concerns regarding the single storey part of the extension and I find no reason to disagree with this finding. Therefore the appeal will solely focus on the proposed two-storey part.
6. Although it would have limited visibility in the streetscene, the cumulative size of the proposed two-storey extension when added to the existing rear outrigger, would subsume the host dwelling and appear overly large and dominant when compared to the surrounding dwellings, including the attached neighbouring property which is original in form. This would be exacerbated by the extension to the width of the existing outrigger which, alongside the significant overall depth, would increase the bulky appearance of the rear projection. It would therefore disrupt the existing pattern of development to the rear of this row of dwellings to the detriment of the character and appearance of the locality.
7. It has been noted that there is a first-floor rear extension at 4 Eastwood Road which the appellant states has been undertaken using permitted development rights. This is some distance from the appeal property with a different roof form and, although it is an anomaly to the typical grain of development on this side of Eastwood Road, it would not set a precedent for other similar development to take place which would result in further harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. In conclusion, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the adjoining property and surrounding area and would be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (2016) and Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018). These policies collectively seek to provide a high-quality design response that has regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces, incorporating design appropriate to its context which respects the local character of the area.

Living Conditions

9. The appeal dwelling is separated from the boundary with No.20 by approximately 1 metre and the dwelling at No.20 by approximately 2 metres. The existing two-storey rear outrigger is set in from the side elevation of the main part of the dwelling by around 0.5 metres. The proposal would bring the rear two-storey section in line with the side elevation of the main dwelling and therefore it would be in closer proximity to the boundary with No.20.
10. When combined with the extension's depth, it would result in a large flank wall with a significant height 2 metres away from the side elevation of the dwelling at No.20 where there are numerous windows. Due to the lower eaves height to be used on the side of the two-storey rear projection closest to No.20, the outlook from the first-floor windows on the neighbouring side elevation would not be significantly impinged by the proposed development. However, there are also two ground floor windows on the side elevation facing the appeal site. The significant depth of the proposed two-storey section, along with its closer proximity, would result in a significant sense of enclosure in this neighbouring house. This would give rise to a harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.20 when using the rooms served by these ground floor windows.

11. It is noted that the proposal would not breach the 45-degree rule for the rear windows on both neighbouring properties. However, this would not address the impact on the ground floor windows on the side elevation at No.20. The appellant has also provided a 24-hour sunlight assessment, however sunlight is a different consideration to outlook and so this assessment does not demonstrate that the outlook from these windows would not be affected. Reference has also been made to the existing single storey rear extension at No.20 in the appeal statement, but this is clearly a different form of development to the two-storey extension proposed.
12. Therefore the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of 20 Eastwood Road and would be contrary to Policy LP26. The relevant section of this policy ensures development does not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in relation to outlook.

Other Matters

13. A drawing has been provided to demonstrate the extensions which could be undertaken under permitted development rights. Although a two-storey rear extension with a depth of 3 metres may be permissible under permitted development rights and would only be slightly smaller than the depth of the extension proposed, the form of the development and its proximity to the neighbouring boundary would be noticeably different. Therefore, it is considered that this fall back would be unlikely to be more harmful than the appeal proposal.
14. The appellant has also raised concerns with the conduct of the Council stating that they failed to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner and did not undertake a site visit. However, this does not affect my consideration of the planning merits of the appeal.

Conclusions and Recommendation

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

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR