



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2023

by C Harding BA (Hons) PGCert PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4TH January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/23/3324629

75 Wellington Road, Wanstead, Redbridge, London E11 2AS

- 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 Erol Ismail against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0556/23, dated 24 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey ground floor rear and side infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In reaching this decision, I have had regard to the revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') that was published on 20 December 2023 but as it does not involve changes to national policy affecting the proposal, I have not sought the parties' comments upon it.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of occupiers of 73 Wellington Road with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached house which features a two-storey rear projection across part of the width of the rear elevation. This ties into a matching projection at the neighbouring property to the north, which itself hosts a further single storey, flat-roofed rear projection. The property to the south ('number 73') also features a similar projection, as well as a further glazed conservatory.
5. Space currently exists between the appeal property and number 73 by virtue of narrow areas at both properties which provide access from the rear gardens to rear entrances, and to the front of the properties by means of side paths. However, these spaces are narrow, and this area currently has a very enclosed character, with two-storey development surrounding it on three sides at close proximity.
6. The side infill element of the proposal would extend to the boundary between the houses, and in doing so would eliminate some of the space that currently separates the appeal property from number 73. I saw on my site visit that number 73 has a rear door and a side elevation window located in this area,

and this window would face directly towards the infill element of the proposal at close proximity.

7. Whilst occupiers of number 73 are already likely to experience low levels of light and outlook from this window given the existing situation, the proposal would exacerbate this. Furthermore, although a single storey extension, it would leave the area around the rear entrance of number 73 feeling enclosed, particularly as the proposal would extend along the shared boundary for a distance of several metres. Overall, the side infill element of the proposal would have an unduly imposing presence that would feel oppressive to the occupiers of number 73.
8. My attention has been drawn to Figure 6 of the Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document ('the SPD'). This is an illustrative sketch drawing indicating a form of development that may be acceptable, having regard to paragraph 3.3.5 of the SPD. This paragraph sets out that the Council's preference is for infill side extensions to not extend beyond the rear elevation of a rear projection, but where wraparound extensions are nevertheless proposed, that they need particularly careful consideration.
9. When Figure 6 is read alongside paragraph 3.3.5 it is apparent that the SPD is indicating configurations that may be acceptable, rather than indicating that such designs would be acceptable in all instances. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposal broadly aligns with the illustration in general terms, in reaching my decision I have considered the proposal on its merits and with regard to the specific situation of the appeal site, and its relationship with the neighbouring property.
10. The proposal would harm the living conditions of occupiers of 73 Wellington Road. It would conflict with Redbridge Local Plan Policies LP26 and LP30, which together, and amongst other factors, state that new development should not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in relation to outlook, and that household extensions should maintain adequate spacing between buildings and an acceptable outlook from surrounding dwellings.
11. It would also conflict with advice contained within the SPD, which states that in designing extensions, it is very important to consider the impact of overall height, depth and width on the amenity of nearby residents in terms of loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure.

Other matters

12. It is stated that the proposal would improve living conditions and create space for an extended family, as well as revive the property. However, there is no detailed evidence before me in respect of any particular family circumstances, and I therefore afford this only very minor weight in my considerations. Whilst the proposal would improve the property, it has not been shown that this could not be achieved by other, less harmful means. Overall, these matters do not outweigh the harm that I have found.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate that a decision

should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

C Harding

INSPECTOR