
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2021

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3257699

16 Cranbrook Rise, Ilford, IG1 3QN

- 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 Ruhman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1587/20, dated 3 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey rear extension at 16 Cranbrook Rise, Ilford, IG1 3QN, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 1587/20, dated 3 June 2020 and the plans submitted with it.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

3. 16 Cranbrook Rise is a two storey end-of-terrace house located in an established residential area characterised by similar properties. Many of these have been altered at the rear with a variety of extensions at ground floor and at roof level.
4. The development the subject of this appeal has been constructed. The single storey rear extension projects a maximum of 6 metres from the original rear elevation of the house across its full width. It has a flat roof with side parapets which take it to a maximum height of 3.75m. I understand that Prior Approval was granted in 2017 for a larger 6 metre rear extension, with a maximum height of 3 metres.
5. I have limited information regarding the considerations leading to the Prior Approval or in what respect the approved extension was larger, but must assume that the impact of that proposal on the neighbouring residents was taken into account at that time. The development as built exceeds the approved height by 0.7m.

6. No.14, to the east, has a single storey rear extension with a monopitch roof which is set away from the boundary with No.16, and forms a small courtyard between it and the new extension adjacent to the house. The common boundary is marked by a timber fence approximately 1.8m high. Although the new extension has contributed to the creation of the courtyard effect at No.14, I consider that the additional 0.7m in height above that previously approved does not have any greater impact on the outlook from No. 14 or its sense of enclosure than would have been the case had the extension been built as approved. Its appearance would have been similar.
7. I conclude that the development does not adversely affect the living conditions of the neighbouring residents and that it is consistent with policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 which relate to design and household extensions and, among other things, seek to protect neighbouring occupiers from development which would result in an adverse impact on their amenity.
8. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

9. The development has already been completed and it is therefore not necessary to impose any conditions.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR