



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2024

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3336874
220 Burrow Road, London IG7 4NQ

- 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 Amit Sharma against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref: 1928/23 dated 29 June 2023 was refused by notice dated 5 January 2024.
 - The application is for entry door and brick wall to front elevation and entry door, one windows and brick wall to side elevation (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for entry door and brick wall to front elevation and entry door, one windows and brick wall to side elevation (retrospective) in accordance with planning application reference 1928/23 dated 29 June 2023 subject to the conditions as set out in the Schedule below.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published in December 2023. I have therefore determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi detached suburban style house clad in a light coloured weatherboard material. In this respect the house is similar to many other properties within the area that appear either similarly clad or rendered. It appears that there may have been an original single storey outbuilding located upon the common boundary between the appeal house and its neighbour. This has seemingly been extended in more recent years further into the rear garden. The result is a linear form of outbuilding extending from the rear of the existing house into a long, gently sloping, garden.

5. The scheme before me seeks retrospective permission for the effective extension of the property to the side with a small flat roof projection to the front elevation of the house. This extension has taken the form of a light weight covering over the former driveway between the house and the boundary fence and is effectively 'capped off' by a parapet wall to the front elevation that largely blocks any view of the extension from the streetscene. There is also access provided into this space, without going through the house, by a single front door.
6. I saw on my site visit that several other properties have extensions of various forms and designs. I also saw that the appeal site sits significantly lower than that of the streetscene and that there is also a level change between the appeal site and its immediate neighbour at number 222 Burrow Road.
7. In assessing the impact of this proposal I consider that the majority of the extending structure to the side is not readily visible from the street. The only part that is is the single storey parapet wall to the side of the house.
8. Although this wall protrudes slightly to the front, its impact is very much limited by its light render appearance and siting somewhat lower than street level. As such I do not consider that there would be any competitiveness of this extension with the dominance of the existing house and that a level of subservience is maintained between the two.
9. Moreover, although the structure extends further along the common boundary between the appeal site and number 222, the level difference and flat roof also means that the extension would not be dominant nor cause harm to the living conditions of this neighbour.
10. As a result, the proposed extension is subservient and proportionate to the main dwelling and of a character whereby the visual impact of the building is contained and limited within the streetscene. As such I consider that the Policy requirements of Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (LP) have been met and that the guidance within the Council's Housing Design SPD have also been addressed.

Conditions

11. I have added the list of conditions as suggested by the Council in their Questionnaire. These include the standard conditions that are appropriate for controlling the detail and design of such a scheme.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I allow the appeal subject to the conditions as set out in the schedule below.

A Graham

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later three years from the date of this decision.
2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 001 Existing (Proposed) Ground Floor Plan, 002 Existing (Proposed) Roof Plan and 003 Existing (Proposed) Elevations all dated 12.06.2023.

END OF SCHEDULE