



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30TH December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3284619

8 Monkams Drive, Woodford Green, Essex, IG8 0LQ

- 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 Miss Bridget Sheppard against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2264/21, dated 26 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of an existing conservatory to rear of property New single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of an existing conservatory to rear of property new single storey rear extension at 8 Monkams Drive, Woodford Green, Essex, IG8 0LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2264/21, dated 26 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Planning 01 OS Extract and block plan (existing); Planning 02 Existing ground floor plan; Planning 03 Rev A Existing roof plan; Planning 04 Rev A Existing Rear Elevation; Planning 05 Rev A Existing Side Elevation Looking North; Planning 06 Rev A Existing Side Elevation Looking South; Planning 07 Rev A Proposed Ground Floor Plan; Planning 08 Proposed Roof Plan; Planning 09 Rev A Proposed Rear Elevation; Planning 10 A Rev A Proposed Side Elevation Section Looking North; Planning 11 Rev C Proposed Side Elevation Looking South.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the living conditions of occupiers of 6 Monkams Drive, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. An existing ground floor rear conservatory projects back from the rear of the host house close to the boundary with the neighbouring property, 6 Monkams Drive. The boundary between the 2 properties comprises a high brick wall which steps down to a lower fence which is covered in vegetation. The fence extends beyond the rear building line of the existing conservatory allowing some views between the rear garden of No6 and that of the host property. It then meets higher hedges and trees along the border which obscure views between the 2 gardens.
4. The proposed development would replace the conservatory with a single storey rear extension. It would run along the side boundary with No 6 replacing the high brick wall and lower vegetated fence with a parapet wall. The parapet wall would be higher than the eaves of the existing conservatory, but the sides and top of the proposed pyramid roof would be lower than the conservatory roof. The Council concluded that the proposed extension side wall would create a sense of enclosure and appear overbearing to occupants of No 6.
5. The rear of No 6 has a plastic roofed wooden lean to which extends from the boundary with the appeal site out from the back wall of the property to where it meets a rear projecting wing. The rear wing has a side window facing the appeal site and a larger rear window facing towards the rear garden. At first floor level there are windows that would be above the height of the side wall of the proposed extension.
6. The proposed development would not have an overbearing impact or create a sense of enclosure when viewed from the first floor windows of No 6 as they would sit above and to the side of the proposed extension. The projecting ground floor wing at No 6 is dual aspect, enabling views down the garden which would be unaffected by the proposed development. The side window already looks onto the side of the conservatory, albeit it is set back from the boundary between the properties. The parapet wall would extend up and beyond the current roof profile of the conservatory and boundary wall. It would therefore present a greater mass when viewed from the side window, but the difference would be relatively small and would not significantly alter the impact beyond that which already exists. Windows on the remainder of the ground floor elevation of No 6 are enclosed by the rear lean to, and views from that structure will already be affected by the existing conservatory.
7. I appreciate that the proposed side wall would be on the boundary with No 6 rather than being set back from it, as is currently the case with the conservatory, and that it would be higher than the existing fence. However, the degree to which it would increase any sense of enclosure or overbearing impact beyond that which already exists would be so limited that it would not significantly impact on the living conditions of occupiers of No 6. As such it would not justify withholding planning permission. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be in accordance with the aims of Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) which seek to ensure that development maintains an acceptable outlook from neighbouring dwellings.

Conditions

8. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR