



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022

**by Peter White BA(Hons) MA DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 23 September 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/22/3292425**

**19 Natal Road, Ilford IG1 2HA**

- 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 Sadir Hussain against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
  - The application Ref 3040/21, dated 13 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2021.
  - The development proposed is the single storey rear extension & proposed conversion of the property into two self contained flats 3 bed flat and 2 bed flat.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The proposed development follows a previous refusal and dismissed appeal (ref APP/W5780/W/19/3242261). That development was of a different design, without the full-width rear extension currently proposed.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the development on: (i) the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Natal Road, with particular regard to outlook.

### Reasons

*Character and appearance:*

4. The appeal site is a mid-terraced dwelling in a residential area with short rear gardens serving dwellings on Natal Road and Jersey Road. Many, including the appeal dwelling, have rear lean-to or flat-roofed single-storey extensions.
5. The existing partial-width rear extension would be replaced with a larger one across the full-width of the plot. Although there are large full-width outbuildings at the rear of some plots, I saw no full-width extensions of the proposed depth in the area. At the scale and depth proposed, the rear extension would appear as a dominating feature in this small garden setting. Retention of a partial-width element, between the original dwelling and the rear of the proposed extension, would also result in an incongruous form, with a small inaccessible yard and a wall terminating part way through a bay window.
6. In conclusion on this issue, although the development would require no physical changes at the front of the dwelling, the rear extension would be

unduly large and would relate poorly to the character of the dwelling and the area. It would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and would conflict with the relevant aspects of Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (2018) (LP) Policy LP26, which requires high quality design. It would also be contrary to the guidance in the London Borough of Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD) as it relates to depth, position and width, and height of single-storey rear extensions. The Council also referred to LP Policy LP30, which I have not found to be relevant to the proposed development as it relates to householder development.

#### *Living conditions*

7. The appeal dwelling is a substantially extended terraced dwelling, with a roof extension, and single and 2-storey rear extensions along the boundary with 17 Natal Road. Predominantly open timber fencing, with planting, runs along the boundary between the appeal site and 21 Natal Road.
8. Within the appeal site the existing extensions are offset from the boundary with No 21 but contribute to a sense of enclosure. This sense of enclosure is increased by a rise in land levels towards the rear of the gardens, and a short two-storey extension at No 21 abutting the boundary with 23 Natal Road.
9. Despite being single storey, the proposed full-width extension would be significantly larger than the existing extension. At 2.9m high, it would also exceed the height of the existing fence and planting along the boundary with No 21. Given its proposed height, depth, and position on the boundary, it would significantly increase the sense of enclosure experienced by occupiers of No 21, and would be overly dominant and oppressive in terms of outlook from No 21's rear ground floor windows.
10. In conclusion on this issue, the development would therefore harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Natal Road, with particular regard to outlook. It would conflict with the relevant aspects of LP Policy LP26, which requires high quality design considering the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. It would also be contrary to the guidance in the SPD as it relates to the depth, position and width, and height of single-storey rear extensions.

#### **Other Matters**

11. The Council's Housing Delivery Test results demonstrate recent under-provision of new housing. Paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) therefore applies, and planning permission should be granted unless adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
12. The provision of one additional unit of residential accommodation would make a small contribution towards increasing housing supply on developed land in an urban location. There would also be small economic benefits of the development to the local area in terms of construction and household expenditure in the local area. The proposed flats would exceed the minimum space standards, and building works may improve the energy efficiency of the building. I have attached some weight to these factors, but given the modest scale of the development proposed, the weight attributable to them is limited.
13. However, the harm I identify to the character and appearance of the area and living conditions of occupiers of 21 Natal Road would significantly and

demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.

14. The appeal site is also within the zone of influence of the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. However, as I am dismissing the appeal I have not considered these matters further.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons above, having regard to the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other material considerations, I conclude the appeal is dismissed.

*Peter White*

INSPECTOR