

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

**by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 24<sup>th</sup> December 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3255098**  
**183 Richmond Road, Ilford IG1 2XN**

- 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 Kamaljit Singh Riyat against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref 0845/20, dated 12 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
  - The development proposed is a temporary structure/display area for fruit and veg.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. However, the original description adequately describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupiers of 185 Richmond Road (No.185) with regard to outlook and sense of enclosure.

### Reasons

4. The appeal premises are occupied by a retail store situated on the corner of Richmond Road and Mortlake Road. The character of the area is formed of residential terraces with commercial premises often occupying the street corners.
5. There are some examples within the area of structures which sit forward of the front building lines occupying the space between the main elevations of commercial premises and the footways. However, such structures are not present on any of the three other frontages on the street corners adjacent to the appeal site.
6. The appeal proposal would be rather bulky and of substantial construction, the plans indicating the structure being formed on brickwork with windows and a polycarbonate roof, extending the full depth and the majority of the width of the frontage to meet the footway. Within this setting such a solidly built and bulky structure which would not respect the established building lines on the

adjacent street corners would form a visually intrusive feature which would detract from the character and appearance of the area.

7. The evidence indicates that the structure would include a solid brick wall on its south east facing side elevation. This would be built to the boundary of the site. However, the neighbouring residential property at No.185 has a bay window to its front elevation that is set only a short distance away from the boundary.
8. As a result of the height (which would be significantly in excess of the existing boundary wall), depth and solidity of the side wall of the structure, the proposal would result in a significant reduction in the existing outlook from this window which would lead to a sense of enclosure for the occupants. This would harm their living conditions and detract from the enjoyment of their home.
9. The proposal would subsequently fail to accord with Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) which amongst other things seeks high quality design which respects the local character of the area and which requires that development does not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in relation to outlook.

### **Other Matters**

10. I note the presence of occasional structures within the locality similar to that proposed. The structures on Richmond Road appear more comparable than other examples that have been provided and I was able to view these on my site visit. However, they do not exactly replicate the relationship between the appeal site and the neighbouring property. I therefore afford their presence limited weight and their existence does not justify the appeal.

### **Conclusion**

11. Taking all relevant matters into account, the appeal should be dismissed.

*T J Burnham*

INSPECTOR