



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2023

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3308146

24 Saltash Road, Ilford IG6 2NL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Daniel Oyelakin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2021/22, dated 13 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension with a depth of 6.00 metres, highest point of 3.29 metres and height at the eaves of 3.00 metres.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The submitted Grounds of Appeal consisted only of a copy of the Council's decision notice. The appellant was given the opportunity to clarify if they were relying on this document as the basis of their appeal, but apart from copies of Council documents, no further Grounds of Appeal were submitted. I also observed on my visit that an extension had been erected to the rear of the property, although this did not appear to reflect the appeal proposal including in respect of the depth of the extension. Notwithstanding these matters, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the submitted evidence.
3. I have taken the application reference number and the description of the development from the Council's decision notice as this accurately represents the details of the proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the adjoining premises of 22 and 26 Saltash Road in respect of outlook and light.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is part of a terrace of properties with gardens to the rear, and the proposed extension would project along the boundary with Nos 22 and 26. Objections to the proposal have been received from residents of Nos 22 and 26 which refer to the effect on outlook and light, amongst other things. It is

therefore necessary to consider the amenity of adjoining premises in accordance with the provisions of the GPDO.

6. In respect of No 22, due to the degree of projection and the massing of the proposal, it would appear as an overbearing and obtrusive feature extending along the boundary. This would lead to an oppressive and enclosing effect in the outlook from the rear elevation of No 22 as well as from the rear amenity area.
7. The Council's reason for refusal does not refer to loss of light, but this has been raised in the objection from No 22. The appeal site is located to the south of No 22, and due to this arrangement development on the site may affect the amount of daylight and sunlight reaching No 22. As a result of its scale and location, the proposal would lead to a significant degree of overshadowing and loss of light to the rear of No 22, including in respect of glazed doors which serve a room within the dwelling, as well as the amenity area.
8. The proposal would project along the boundary with No 26, which has also been extended to the rear. However, although the proposal would project beyond that extension, the degree of projection would not be to an extent that would lead to unacceptable harm to the amenity of residents of No 26 regarding outlook. The appeal site is also located to the north of No 26 which would limit the impact of the proposal on the amount of light reaching that premises.
9. Notwithstanding my conclusions in respect of No 26, the proposal would lead to significant harm to the amenity of the adjoining property of No 22 in respect of loss of outlook and light. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR