



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3261268

40 Gordon Road, Wanstead, London, E11 2RB

- 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 Dennis Weeks against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2378/20, dated 30 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension including the demolition of a small outbuilding and partial demolition of the existing rear extension at 40 Gordon Road, Wanstead, London, E11 2RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2378/20, dated 30 July 2020, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 25-08-20.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural matter

2. The Council's decision describes the proposal as 'demolish small outbuilding and part demolish rear extension. Single storey side/rear extension.' From the submitted documents it is clear that the proposal includes those demolition works but the plans indicate a rear extension, not a side extension. I have therefore included the demolition works in the formal decision but retained the appellant's description as a rear extension. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policies LP26 and LP30 in the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) which seek

- to ensure that developments respect the local character of the area and that extensions are subordinate to the host building in terms of size and scale.
4. The appeal site is located within a residential street and comprises a modest sized, mid terrace dwelling built in the 1970's. The dwellings in this terrace were originally built with outbuildings sited 1m from the rear elevation which had a depth of some 6 although most of those have since been demolished. Most of the dwellings have been extended to the rear with flat roof extensions.
 5. The appeal dwelling has a full width loft conversion with a flat roof dormer and a flat roof rear extension of some 3.8m deep. The proposed rear extension would demolish what remains of the original outbuilding and would incorporate the existing rear extension. It would occupy the most of the width of the dwelling and would project forward of the original rear wall by 6m, with a flat roof of the same height as the existing extension.
 6. The Council's Housing Design SPD (2019) advises that such extensions should be no deeper than 3.5m. The reason given in the SPD for that limit is to avoid being overbearing and causing a significant loss of outlook, light, or an increased sense of enclosure. However, the Council's officer's report concluded that it would not harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. Given the limited projection beyond the neighbouring properties' rear extensions I would agree with that assessment. Whilst it would be slightly deeper than most of the other rear extensions in this terrace, I saw at my visit that no 36 has a similarly sized extension. In the context of the appeal dwelling's large roof extension and the other rear extensions within this terrace, the proposed extension would not appear unduly bulky or overbearing.
 7. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. A condition requiring matching external materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

Conclusion

8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the dwelling or the area and would accord with the development plan policies referred to earlier. The appeal is allowed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector