



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3269988

7 Christie Gardens, Chadwell Heath, Romford, RM6 4SA.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO)
 - The appeal is made by Mr Abdullah Shaheen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4393/20, dated 28 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of the GPDO for a single storey rear extension at 7 Christie Gardens, Chadwell Heath, Romford, RM6 4SA in accordance with application, Ref 4393/20 made on the 28 December 2020, and the details submitted with it, pursuant to Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.4(2).

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 9 Christie Gardens in terms of its potential to impact on outlook, overshadow and result in an increased sense of enclosure.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 7 Christie Gardens, is a two-storey terraced house. While number 5 has a single storey side extension 9 Christie Gardens remains unextended. From the aerial photograph and the evidence provided I see that number 9 has, adjacent to the boundary, a garden door and window at ground floor level, serving a kitchen, with a first floor window over.
4. The appellant proposes, following the demolition of an existing conservatory, a full width single storey rear extension. It would be 6.0 metres deep, with a mono-pitched roof the eaves height of which would be 2.7 metres. It would slope back towards the rear wall of the host property at which point the maximum height would be 3.5 metres.
5. Given its limited height and the shallow pitch of the proposed roof the extension would only be a little higher than a typical close-boarded garden

boundary fence for much of its length. Further, number 9 benefits from a long south facing garden.

6. Taking these factors into account, and based on the limited evidence to the contrary, I conclude that the proposal would not materially harm the living conditions of the occupiers of number 9 in terms loss of outlook, overshadowing or a sense of enclosure.
7. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed extension would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 9 as suggested by the Council.

Conditions

8. Certain requirements of development as proposed here are already set out in the legislation and it is therefore unnecessary to repeat them in conditions; GPDO paragraph A.4 (11) (a) in particular specifies that the development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details (which in this case are principally shown on the drawings).

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and prior approval granted.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR