



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2024

**by B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 11 March 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/23/3323986**

**65A High Street, Barkingside, Ilford, Redbridge IG6 2AF**

- 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 Richard Schwartz, Riks Development Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref 0754/23, dated 15 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2023.
  - The development proposed is described as L - Shaped Loft Extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matter

2. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework in December 2023, replacing the previous version dating from September 2023. Whilst this made certain revisions to aspects of national planning policy, the provisions in respect of the main issues of this case are largely unchanged. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised National Planning Policy Framework from the parties, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

## Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
  - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and
  - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 61A and 63A High Street, with particular regard to light and outlook.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal property is a residential unit located on the upper floors, above a ground floor commercial unit within a mid-terrace building. The other properties within the terrace are uniform in design, albeit some have dormer window projections within their rear roofs. The property is accessed from a raised walkway via a busy parking and service area used by the commercial units within the terrace.

5. The proposal would be prominent in views from the rear parking and service area. It would be expansive, spanning the full width of the rear roof, as well as covering much of the roof of an existing rear projection. The large, flat roof dormer would also span almost from the roofs' eaves to the ridge height with minimal set back from either, creating a particularly bulky addition which would result in an out of proportion and dominant form of development. Overall, the proposed development, due to its size and bulk, would fail to respect the original form and architecture of the building.
6. The appeal property and surrounding area are not designated heritage assets. The sole aspect of the appeal development visible from the front of the property would be the two rooflights, which will not harm the character and appearance of the area. Be that as it may, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
7. Whilst there are other rear dormer windows and projections within the terrace, during my site visit, I did not observe any of the same scale as the appeal proposal. In any event, this proposal has been assessed on its own merits.
8. The Council raises concerns about the proposed external materials. Whilst the appellant considers that the proposed materials will not appear incongruous, had I found the design to be acceptable, the exact materials to be used could have been controlled by planning condition.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal development would harm the character and appearance of the area. I therefore find that it would conflict with Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (RLP). The policy seeks to ensure, amongst other aspects, that all new development is of a high standard of design and respects local character.

#### *Neighbouring occupiers*

10. The proposal would project along the boundary with 61a and 63a High Street. The properties have windows at second floor level which, from the submitted evidence, appear to serve habitable rooms and which face towards the appeal site.
11. The views from these windows would look directly towards the proposal's rear elevation with minimal separation distances. Overall, the proposal would add significant additional bulk to the host building. Due to its proximity and minimal separation distance from the neighbouring properties' windows, it would be a dominant and oppressive feature.
12. The presence of a roof extension of this depth, height and with limited separation would also overshadow No 61a and 63a's second floor windows. Whilst the appellant refers to a sun study, I have not been provided with any further details or technical evidence. Overall, in the absence of substantive evidence to demonstrate otherwise, I find that the extension, due to its height and proximity, would reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight reaching the neighbouring accommodation. This would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 61a and 63a High Street with particular regard to light and outlook. I therefore find that it would conflict with Policy LP26 of the RLP. The policy seeks to ensure, amongst other aspects, that development

does not result in adverse impacts on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in relation to outlook and daylight and sunlight.

**Other Matter**

14. The appellant has indicated that the proposed design is eco friendly. Be that as it may, this matter does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

**Conclusion**

15. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and would have a harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*B Pattison*

INSPECTOR