



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2024

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3350660

112 Nightingale Lane, Wanstead, Redbridge, London E11 2EZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mark Ramsay against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref is 1464/24.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension at 112 Nightingale Lane, Wanstead, Redbridge, London E11 2EZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1464/24, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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 plan: 1416/407-02
 - 3) 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.
 - 4) The first floor window to the bathroom in the rear elevation of the development hereby permitted shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor shall be capable of being opened.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on:
 - The character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area; and
 - The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal dwelling is a palisaded two storey semi-detached house on an irregularly shaped plot, which narrows to the flank side. As the plot widens towards its adjoining neighbour the house is deeper, resulting in an 'L' shaped footprint. It is located in an area made up of two storey semi-detached and terraced houses that demonstrate a variety of age and architectural expression.
4. The proposal is for a two storey rear extension that would be positioned toward the centre of the appeal dwelling, to the side of the existing deepest part of the existing house and would project rearwards from the shallowest part of the appeal dwelling by approximately 3 metres. The proposal would have a hipped roof form, that would join with the existing roof below the existing roof ridge, resulting in subordinate massing. It would also be built in brick and with roof tiles to match existing and with window and door opening that reflect the proportions and form of existing. As such, the proposal accords with the design guidance for such extensions set out in the Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (the SPD).
5. The proposed extension would project rearwards towards the rear fence that defines the boundary between the appeal plot and properties on Halstead Road that back on to it. Given its, central position, subordinate massing and matching materials, the proposal would appear as a secondary, complementary and subordinate rather than dominating addition to the appeal dwelling.
6. The proposal would be visible in views of the appeal dwelling from Nightingale Lane, where there is a bend in the street towards its junction with Rodney Road. Given the scale of the proposal and its central position on the rear, it would have a minimal presence in these views and would only have a minimal infilling effect on the separating distance between the appeal dwelling and the properties on Halstead Road that back on to it. As a result, I do not find that the proposal would result in a cramped building form, but rather that the proposal would reflect the scale and separation between properties in its immediate local area.

Living Conditions

7. Although the 2 storey proposal would project rearwards towards properties in Halstead Road, this is within the context of these properties themselves having significant rear extensions, including two storey extensions and rear roof dormer extensions. As a result, the proposal reflects the scale, form and separating distances of neighbouring properties and the density of existing development in the immediate local area.
8. For these reasons, I do not find that the proposal would have an overbearing impact or result in an increase in the existing sense of enclosure of properties in Halstead Road including 77 and 79 Halstead Road (No's. 77 and 79). Consequently, the proposal would not result in any significant loss of outlook to occupiers of these neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

9. Other parties have raised concerns with regard to loss of privacy in relation to rear gardens No's. 77 and 79 that back on to the appeal dwelling. However, given the existing substantial overlooking of gardens from the rear of neighbouring terraced properties, the additional overlooking from the rear of the appeal dwelling would be minimal, and a suitable condition attached to the approval to require obscured glazing to the proposed first floor bathroom to protect the privacy of occupiers of the appeal dwelling would further reduce the effect in this regard.
10. Concerns have also been raised with regard to loss of light to the gardens of No's. 77 and 79 that back on to the appeal dwelling. However, given the relatively small scale of the proposal and the distances involved, I do not find that the proposal would result in any significant loss of daylight or sunlight to the gardens of these properties to the extent that it would result in any harm to the living conditions of occupiers of these neighbouring properties.
11. For the reasons given above I do not find that the proposal results in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area and would not result in harm of any significance to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. As such, it accords with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018), Policies D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). Collectively these seek to ensure that development, including extensions, is of high design quality, responds to local character and context and is compatible with the existing area character and patterns of development, having no significant impact on the amenity of surrounding residents.

Conditions

12. Along with the standard condition for the time limit on implementation of the development, in the interests of design quality, I have included conditions requiring compliance with approved plans and the use of matching materials to existing. In the interests of privacy, I have also included a condition requiring obscured glazing.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, and with regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR