



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2024

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3347391

23 Wanstead Park Road, Redbridge, Ilford IG1 3TG

- 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 Sovereign Network Group against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 3736/23.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension, fenestration upgrades and installation of wheelchair access ramp to front along with internal alternations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. A drawing showing a ramp with railings is attached to the appellant's grounds of appeal¹. As this is a householder appeal I am required to determine it on the basis of the information submitted with the planning application. This includes a ground floor plan showing a ramp at the front of the appeal property but no drawings showing this in elevation. As such I have assessed this element of the proposal on the basis that it comprises solely a ramp and would be of the size shown on the application plan.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
 - (i) the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Wanstead Park Road, with particular regard to outlook,
 - (ii) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and
 - (iii) on the health and life expectancy of nearby trees.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms one end of a short terrace of 2-storey houses with 2-storey outriggers to the rear. Like many of its neighbours the property also includes a single-storey ground floor addition to the side of the outrigger. Like

¹ Drawing RST151.15SPLT0RW1.2SU0 prepared by Rapid Ramp

the vast majority of the houses in this part of Wanstead Park Road the front boundary has been removed and a hardstanding formed to provide off-street car parking.

Living Conditions

5. The proposal would primarily comprise the erection of a flat-roofed, single storey rear addition to provide an additional bedroom with an en-suite. This would protrude a significant distance beyond the rear wall of the outrigger and result in the formation of a long wall along the garden boundary shared with the next door house, 21 Wanstead Park Road. The long flank wall would severely enclose the neighbouring area of garden immediately to the rear of No. 21 resulting in a significant loss of outlook from this property.
6. For these reasons I conclude that, due to its siting, height and length, the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 21. As such the proposal fails to accord with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) (RLP) and D3 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) which, amongst other matters, promote high quality design that does not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and maintains acceptable outlook from surrounding dwellings.

Character and Appearance

7. The proposal also includes the installation of an access ramp at the front of the property. The application plans state that this would have a "1800 run @1:15" and the exact location/orientation is to be confirmed. In the context of frontages dominated by parked cars I am satisfied that this low level and relatively short element, the materials for which could be controlled by a planning condition, would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area.
8. Consequently, this element of the proposal, as shown on the application drawings, accords with RLP Policies LP26 and LP30 and LP Policy D3 which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development is of high design quality, responds to local character and context and is compatible with the existing area character and patterns of development.

Trees

9. There are a significant number of trees to the rear of the appeal property and its immediate neighbours to either side. These vary greatly in respect of their size age and quality with the more substantial ones being a good distance away from the rears of the dwellings. The information before me indicates that the trees closest to the proposed rear extension comprise a pair of apple trees. The proposal would be outside the root protection areas of these trees and would afford sufficient space for the crowns of these trees to prosper.
10. Due to its siting an adequate distance from trees the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the health and life expectancy of these trees. It therefore accords with RLP Policy LP38 which seeks to maintain tree coverage in the borough and the landscaping aims of RLP Policy LP26.

Other Matters

11. I note that the proposal would make the property suitable for occupation by a disabled person with all the necessary facilities provided on the ground floor. However, it is not evident to me from the information provided that an extension of the size proposed is needed to create this accommodation given the ample existing footprint of the ground floor. For these reasons I attribute limited weight to this matter.

Conclusions

12. Although I have concluded that the proposal would not result in unacceptable effects in respect of the second and third main issues, for the reasons set out under the first main issue, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR