



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2020

by Alex Hutson MRTPI CMLI MArborA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3260395

8 Wincanton Gardens, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 2BP

- 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 Ahmed Ishtiaq against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1610/20, dated 4 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey side extension to be used as storage (garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a single storey side extension to be used as storage (garage) at 8 Wincanton Gardens, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 2BP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1610/20, dated 4 June 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: Location Plan; N.A/8WG/201 Issue A; N.A/8WG/202 Issue A; N.A/8WG/203 Issue A; N.A/8WG/204 Issue A; N.A/8WG/205 Issue A; N.A/8WG/206 Issue A; and N.A/8WG/207 Issue A.
 - 3) No development shall commence above ground level until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary matters

2. I observed during the site visit that 8 Wincanton Gardens has been subject to a number of recent alterations and additions and thus, the existing plans as submitted do not reflect the current situation. These alterations and additions relate to windows, a porch, rendering to the frontage of the main building and a single storey side extension which is also rendered and which incorporates a garage door. It is unclear to me whether any of the alterations and additions benefit from planning permission where necessary. In addition, the single storey side extension appeared to me to incorporate some features not shown on the proposed plans as submitted, to be of a different finish and potentially

to be of a lesser depth. Accordingly, and for the avoidance of doubt, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the existing and proposed plans as submitted.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a wider residential area. It comprises No 8, a two storey end of terrace dwelling, set within a triangular shaped plot. The southwestern side boundary of the appeal site is angled and runs along the rear boundaries of some dwellings along Beaminster Gardens. Between No 8 and this boundary, there was, prior to the erection of the single storey side extension, a tapering gap of a modest size. The proposal seeks to largely fill in this gap with the erection of a single storey side extension with a garage door.
5. The Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD), in general, aims to encourage high quality design and development which respects the character of buildings, streets and neighbourhoods. In respect of single storey side extensions, the SPD advises that: they reflect the style of the host property; that the side wall should be made parallel to the house and not follow the line of an angled shared boundary; that a separate front entrance door would not be acceptable; and, that on sites of an open character, such as in Figure 10, they maintain a one metre gap from the side boundary to maintain an open aspect. Figure 10 of the SPD shows the relationship between dwellings on the bend of a road which share a side boundary.
6. Whilst the proposal would be built up to the angled side boundary of No 8, the relationship of No 8 to dwellings along Beaminster Gardens is not reflective of the relationship of properties in Figure 10 of the SPD. The modest sized tapering gap between No 8 and its side boundary which would have existed previously, would have provided little in the way of an open character of the appeal site or that of the street scene and area. Any open character of this end of Wincanton Gardens is primarily afforded by the rear gardens of properties along Beaminster Gardens. I also observed that No 3 has a single storey flat roofed side element with a garage door, and as such, one at No 8 would not appear particularly out of character. Additionally, some other properties along Wincanton Gardens also display garage doors at ground floor level. Furthermore, given the presence of a single storey flat roofed garage structure to the rear of 28 Beaminster Gardens and which fronts Wincanton Gardens, it would not be particularly apparent in views from along Wincanton Gardens that the proposal followed an angled boundary.
7. In light of the above, I consider that the proposal would not appear as an incongruous, overbearing or inappropriate addition that would detract from any open aspect. Rather, I consider that it would be an addition to No 8 that would respect the character and appearance of the street scene and area.
8. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 adopted 2018. These policies require, amongst other things, development to respect the local character of the area, to complement the character of the host building and to maintain or improve

the appearance of the locality and street scene. The proposal would also comply with the general aims of the SPD to encourage high quality design and development which respects the character of buildings, streets and neighbourhoods.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the planning conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the statutory time limit condition, I agree that a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. I also agree that a condition relating to materials is necessary in the interests of character and appearance. However, given the recent changes to No 8, I have made provision for details of materials for the extension hereby permitted to be submitted and approved.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Alex Hutson

INSPECTOR