



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3274964

301 The Drive, Cranbrook, Ilford, London, IG1 3PN

- 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 M Akhtar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1211/21, dated 24 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'single storey rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:-
 - the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area;
 - the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at 299 The Drive with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The development plan includes policies LP26 and LP30 in the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (LP) which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that developments are of a high quality design and of a scale that enhances the character of the dwelling and respects the surrounding area. The Council's Housing Design SPD (2018) seeks to ensure that rear extensions are limited to a depth of 3.5m.
4. The appeal site lies within a residential area, characterised mainly by traditional terraced dwellings set back from the street with good sized rear gardens. Many of the gardens of corner plots make a positive contribution to the openness of the area. The appeal dwelling is a traditional end of terrace property in a terrace of similar dwellings, all of which have been extended to the rear with single storey rear extensions. It has previously been extended to the side and rear by two storey and single storey extensions and to the roof. There is also a large outbuilding at the end of the rear garden. It occupies a prominent corner position at the junction of The Drive and Castle Drive.
5. The proposed extension would be some 5.7m in depth with a flat roof. It would be attached to an existing rear extension and would replace an existing conservatory. It would extend a further 3.2m beyond the conservatory, resulting in a total rear projection of 9.2m according to the Council. As such, it would significantly exceed the

SPD requirement and would be deeper than any of the other extensions in this terrace. The increased amount of built development along the side boundary with the road would appear disproportionate to the scale of the dwelling and the area and would unacceptably further reduce the rear garden area and the openness of this corner plot.

6. I conclude then that by reason of its depth, the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, contrary to the development plan policies referred to above.

Living conditions

7. LP policies LP26 and LP30 in the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) also seek to ensure that developments have no adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of, amongst other things, outlook.
8. The Council has said that the proposed extension would project 6.2m beyond the rear elevation of the adjoining property at 299 The Drive. The appellant says that it would be in line with the neighbouring extension and the submitted plans also indicate that. However, at my site visit I saw that the rear extension at no 299 projects slightly beyond the existing conservatory at the appeal site. As the proposed extension would replace and project 3.2m beyond the conservatory, it would not be in line with the neighbouring property. However, the projection beyond the neighbouring extension would be less than 3.2m and considerably less than the 6.2m projection stated by the Council. Consequently, the extension would not unacceptably increase the sense of enclosure or appear unduly overbearing when seen from the neighbouring property.
9. I conclude, therefore, that it would not cause significant harm to the outlook of the neighbouring occupier/s at no 299 and would be acceptable in this regard. It would accord with the development plan policies referred to in paragraph 7.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and notwithstanding the lack of harm I have found in terms of living conditions, the harm I have found in regard to character and appearance is significant and overriding. As the proposal would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector