



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2024

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/23/3331395

219 Prospect Road, Woodford Green, IG8 7NF

- 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 Mrs Sophia Darrell Brady against the decision of The London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2264/23, dated 29 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear/wrap around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single-storey rear/wrap around extension at 219 Prospect Road, Woodford Green, IG8 7NF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2264/23, dated 29 July 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan – ELA/17 Rev A; Proposed Block Plan – ELA/14 Rev A; Proposed Layout – ELA/3 Rev A; Proposed Elevations – ELA/6 Rev A; and Proposed Roof Plan – ELA/13/ Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling at number 217 Prospect Road, with regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is terraced dwelling, which is situated in a densely built-up area of Woodford Green. A number of properties along Prospect Road have been altered and extended with rear extensions being commonplace.
4. The proposal, which is the resubmission of an earlier refused application (0796/23) is to construct a rear single-storey wrap around extension that would provide an enlarged kitchen. It would be built close to the shared side

boundary with number 217 and it would project out 6m from the main rear wall of the dwelling. It would have hipped roof on the side facing number 217.

5. The proposed extension would undoubtedly have an impact on the outlook from the nearest rear-facing ground-floor window of number 217, because of the length and height of the extension and its position close to the boundary. In that regard, I consider that the proposal would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the adopted Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (LP). These policies seek to ensure (amongst other things) that development does not have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
6. In addition, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Housing Design advises that single-storey rear extensions on terraced properties should generally have a maximum depth of 3.5m and a maximum side wall height of 2.4m, if a wrap around extension is proposed. The proposed extension exceeds these guidelines.
7. Notwithstanding, my attention has been drawn to a Prior Approval notification that was considered by the Council under reference 1579/23. That proposal was for a single-storey rear extension 6m deep and 3m high. The Council determined that prior approval was not required. Consequently, this is a material consideration in my assessment of the current appeal.
8. The Prior Approval proposal was for an extension positioned alongside the side boundary with number 217. The plans show its side wall eaves to be nearly 2.4m high with the highest point of the roof being nearly 3.4m high. These measurements are not dissimilar to the appeal proposal.
9. Whilst the appeal extension would be wider, the impact on number 217 would not be significantly different to the Prior Approval proposal. As there is a strong possibility that the latter will be built regardless, I conclude that the appeal proposal is acceptable, notwithstanding the conflict with the Development Plan and the Council's associated guidance.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and the list of approved plans, a condition is also imposed requiring the use of matching external materials. This is necessary to ensure a satisfactory external appearance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR