



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022

by H Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/22/3291478

4 & 4a Cherry Tree Rise, Buckhurst Hill IG9 6EX

- 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 Siggins & Mrs Brown against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2833/21, dated 30 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a double storey side extension to a ground floor and first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are;
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
 - whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers with regard to private amenity space.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. Formerly one half of a semi-detached unit, the appeal property comprises 2 self-contained flats and occupies a prominent end of terrace location. Whilst the surrounding area is characterised by a mix of housing types, neighbouring properties comprise predominantly semi-detached units. Collectively, the position of properties within their plots and spacing of dwellings creates a regular and balanced development pattern which positively contributes to the suburban character of the area.
4. The height of the proposed extension would be subservient to the host dwelling and set back from the main building line. Nevertheless, the width of the extension would exceed more than half the width of the existing building. The disproportionate scale of the proposal would disrupt the visual balance of the terrace and street pattern, resulting in a dominant and incongruous form of development. Although the roof form, fenestration, materials and general siting have regard to the surrounding area, this would not prevent the proposed

extension from reading as a dominant and visually intrusive addition to the property.

5. It is acknowledged that the appeal site is not a protected asset or located within a designated area. Nevertheless, the Redbridge LP still requires development proposals to be respectful of local character and appearance.
6. Accordingly, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (LP). Amongst other aspects, these policies seek to ensure development proposals respect existing character and integrate with their surroundings. It would also fail to comply with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living Conditions

7. The existing garden area is located to the side and rear of the appeal property and comprises a grassed area enclosed by a timber fence. The proposed extension would extend nearly the full width of the garden, significantly diminishing the useable garden area providing only a limited space for future occupants to sit out.
8. The appellant indicates that the appeal site is within reasonable distance of public open space including the River Roding and nearby woodland. Nevertheless, Policy LP29 of the LP requires all new development to provide sufficient external private and/or communal amenity space to meet the needs of its occupants. In this case, contrary to the policy's wellbeing objectives, the proposed development would double the number of bedrooms within each flat whilst significantly reducing the functionality of the existing garden area.
9. The appellant contends that the garden area would maintain a distinction between private and public space whilst also being commensurate with 6 and 6A Cherry Tree Rise. I am however told by the Council that the adjoining development comprises 4 self-contained units, 2 of which are studio flats and therefore it is understood to be of a smaller scale. Even so, the occupants of Nos 6 and 6A are believed to have access to defined areas of amenity space, albeit of a compact form. No such provision is demonstrated within the submitted evidence. I am therefore not persuaded that the development is justified on this basis.
10. Policy LP29 clearly distinguishes between new development and new housing development and does not exclude extensions from the requirement to provide adequate amenity provision. Therefore, contrary to the appellant's assertion regarding the relevance of policy LP29, I find this policy to be pertinent to this appeal.
11. In concluding this matter, I find that the proposed development fails to provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers with particular regard to private amenity space. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policies LP26 and LP29 of the LP, which amongst other aspects seek to ensure adequate provision for private and/or communal amenity space. It would also fail to comply with the design objectives of the Framework.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

H Wilkinson

INSPECTOR