
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2021

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3264215

241 Prospect Road, Woodford Green, IG8 7NG

- 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 Miss Nina Chaudhary against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 2038/20, dated 7 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension at 241 Prospect Road, Woodford Green, IG8 7NG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2038/20, dated 7 July 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: Drawing numbers GBZ_001.1 Rev B (location and site plan), GBZ_200.1 Rev C (proposed block plan), GBZ_201.1 Rev B (proposed ground floor plan), GBZ_202.2 (proposed elevations C & D) and GBZ_202.1 Rev B (proposed elevation B).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surface of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the host dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of occupiers at 243 Prospect Road, with particular regard to outlook and enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow, which has existing extensions to its side, rear and roof. The adjoining property (no. 243) and the adjacent pair of identical semi-detached dwellings (nos. 245 and 247) have all been extended into the roof and to the rear, in a similar manner. The wider surrounding area comprises a mixture of houses to the south of the site and

similar style dormer bungalows to the north, the majority of which appear to have been significantly extended to the rear.

4. Based upon my site visit and correct reading of the submitted drawings, it is clear that the proposed flat roof extension at the appeal site would be in keeping with the existing flat roof extension to the host property and with the flat roof extension at adjoining no. 243, which projects further from the original rear wall of the dwellings than the appeal proposal would. I am aware that adjoining no.243, being on a smaller plot, does not have a side extension however; it is the same in terms of its proximity to its site boundaries.
5. Whilst I have had regard to the council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) this is guidance not policy, which despite being adopted in 2019, does not take account of permitted development rights for larger house extensions. Moreover, such guidance must always be balanced against other material considerations, including existing and adjacent extensions, which form part of the character of the site and its surroundings.
6. I therefore conclude on this matter that the proposed extension would not be intrusive or out of scale and character with the existing and surrounding dwellings. Accordingly, it would not conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted March 2018), which seek amongst other things, to ensure that household extensions complement the existing building in terms of scale, roof form and materials.

Living conditions

7. Adjoining no. 243 is slightly higher than the appeal dwelling. Its original rear window looks out onto a narrow pathway between an approximately 2 metre high fence and its own long rear extension. The side windows of the extension at no. 243, two of which appear to be small, obscure glazed, bathroom windows, face the solid timber boundary fence, above which the top of the existing extension at the appeal site is visible. Consequently none of these windows currently enjoys an open outlook.
8. The proposed extension would be no higher and no closer to the shared boundary with no. 243 than the existing extension. A gap of over 3 metres wide would be retained between the side elevations of the two neighbouring extensions. No objections have been received from the owners or occupiers of no. 243. As the extension at no. 243 extends further back than the proposed extension on the appeal site, there would be no impact on the garden or on windows in the rear elevation of the extension at no.243.
9. The effect of the proposal on the outlook and sense enclosure from the ground floor rear and side windows at no.243, would be little different to those currently experienced from that property or to those experienced from the rear windows of the appeal site, which is also enclosed by a fence and the longer and higher extension at no. 243.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a serious or adverse effect on the living conditions of occupants at no. 243 Prospect Road. Accordingly there would be no conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted March 2018), which seek amongst other things, to ensure that household extensions maintain adequate spacing between buildings and an acceptable outlook from surrounding dwellings.

Conditions

11. I have imposed the statutory time limit condition and a condition listing the approved plans in the interests of certainty. I have also imposed a condition to ensure the external materials of the extension matches those of the existing dwelling in the interests of good design and protecting the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR