

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3269167
93 Cowley Road, Cranbrook, Ilford, IG1 3JJ

- 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 Saleem Adam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3995/20 dated 27 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension. First floor rear extension. Alterations to fenestrations. Raised patio with steps down to garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. A previous application¹ for a single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension and alterations to fenestration was refused.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 95 Cowley Road, with regards to outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace dwelling that has been extended to the rear.
5. The appeal property is located in a residential area, largely characterised by the presence of two storey terraced dwellings. Dwellings are set back from the road behind short gardens and/or parking areas. To the rear, the appeal property, like neighbouring dwellings along the same side of Cowley Road, steps down to a longer garden, which is set at a lower level than the house.
6. During my site visit, I observed that whilst the set-back and similar bay-fronted design of dwellings provides for an attractive sense of uniformity, many dwellings along Cowley Road have been altered and/or extended, including changes to the sides, the roofs and most notably, to the rear of dwellings.

¹ Reference: 3263/20.

Generally, such changes tend to appear in keeping with host properties and to take the amenity of neighbours into account.

7. The proposed development would extend to the rear adjacent to the shared boundary with Number 95 Cowley Road. During my site visit, I observed that the patio doors opening onto a small patio-style area provide for an important outlook from the rear of No 95. I also observed that, along with a kitchen window, the patio doors provide the main rear outlook from the ground floor of No 95.
8. The height, projection and immediate proximity of the proposed development would result in it dominating the outlook from No 95's patio doors. These characteristics would, I find, result in the proposal appearing to "loom over" the small neighbouring patio area, leading to an undue sense of enclosure.
9. In addition to the above, the proposed development would project beyond the area where the garden of No 95 falls away to a lower level and I consider that its overall scale and immediate proximity would combine to it appearing as an overly dominant feature when seen from that part of No 95's rear garden closest to the house.
10. In support of his case, the appellant states that the proposal would not result in a significant extension adjacent to the boundary with No 95. However, for the reasons set out above, I have found that the proposal would result in a significant adverse impact. The proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 95 Cowley Road with regards to outlook, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to Local Plan² policies LP26 and LP30, which together amongst other things, protect residential amenity.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

² Redbridge Local Plan (2018).