



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2022

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23RD May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3287082

3 Felstead Avenue, Ilford IG5 0QJ

- 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 Harmeet Singh Chana against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3473/21, dated 13 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2021.
 - The proposed development is the erection of a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, No. 5 Felstead Avenue.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling the other half of which lies on the corner of Felstead Road and Cheriton Road. Felstead Road is predominantly characterised by pairs of semi-detached properties of similar age and design which generally have hipped roofs and front bay windows.
4. The dwelling on the appeal site has a garage to the side with attached flat roofed single-storey extension wrapping around the rear of the dwelling. The flank wall of this extension is sited right on the boundary and comprises a wall of around 3 metres height.
5. The adjoining property to the north, No. 5 Felstead Avenue, is also a semi-detached property of similar proportions. It has a garage to the side extending to about two-thirds of the depth of the dwelling. I was unable to gain access to this property but the neighbour has indicated that there is a side facing kitchen window just to the rear of the garage which is the sole window providing light to that room, though it appeared that there is a rear door into the garden. I was able to see that there is also a first floor window and smaller lower window that appears to serve a bathroom and landing / stairs respectively.
6. The proposed first floor addition would result in a significantly higher flank wall on the common boundary albeit with hipped roof sloping away. The rear part of the extended flank wall would face directly towards the windows in the side elevation of the adjoining dwelling. In the case of the kitchen window this would, in my opinion, result in a considerable and material change to its outlook notwithstanding the existing relationship noted above.

7. The neighbour contends by way of expert advice that the proposed extension would not satisfy the preliminary tests set out in BRE Guidance in respect of impacts on sunlight and daylight. As a result it is suggested that further more detailed tests are required in order to ascertain whether these impacts are acceptable. Given the resulting relationship between the proposed extension and the windows in the adjoining property and taking into account that the appeal site is located to the south of this adjoining property, I consider that such further assessments are needed in order to be able to conclude whether the impact would be acceptable.
8. Overall, therefore, I am not convinced that the living conditions of the occupier of this adjoining property would not be adversely impacted thereby resulting in a poor quality of design. This would be contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) which seek development that is well integrated with the local area and is of high quality in terms of the impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusions

9. The Appellant has referred to what are suggested to be a number of similar extensions that have been permitted in Felstead Avenue. However, no specific information has been provided to demonstrate that these extensions have the same or comparable relationship with adjoining properties as that on the appeal site and therefore I can give only little weight to this factor.
10. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR