



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2024

by **Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3353855

41 Grosvenor Gardens, Woodford Green, London IG8 0BE

- 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 Vincent Lavocat against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application reference is 2241/24.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension to a private dwelling, to ground floor only.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. On 12 December 2024, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework 2024) was published. The Framework 2024 does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of 39 Grosvenor Gardens with regard to outlook and visual impact.

Reasons

4. Planning permission is sought for a single storey extension at the rear of the appeal property, which is semi-detached dwelling within a predominantly residential area. Like No 41, several properties along Grosvenor Gardens had been extended and externally altered including those to which the appellant has referred. Therefore, there is some variety to the existing built form in the area to which the site belongs.
5. The new addition would extend across almost the full width of the plot and therefore exceed the width of the main 2-storey house. It would also project from the main rear wall for about 4-metres. In doing so, the proposal would elongate the built form of No 41, enlarge its footprint and noticeably add to its scale and mass. The depth of the appeal scheme would exceed the maximum threshold for extensions of this type that is advised in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Housing Design* (SPD). Furthermore, it could not reasonably be described as subordinate in scale to the existing building, which is expected of household extensions in Policy LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP).

6. When seen from the rear of the site and the back gardens of the properties on either side of No 41, the new extension would occupy an elevated position due to the notable difference in ground level. From these lower-level vantage points, the appeal scheme would draw the eye given its considerable width, scale and height. To my mind, it would appear as an overly large addition that would visually dominate the rear façade of No 41 in conflict with the advice within the SPD. As such, the proposed extension would unduly distort the proportions of the host dwelling and spoil its intrinsic character, even taking into account the sizeable dormer that has been introduced at the rear of No 41. Consequently, the appeal scheme would be an unwelcome addition to the local area.
7. With regard to the second main issue, living conditions, the new flank wall would be up to the shared rear boundary with 39 Grosvenor Gardens. By projecting beyond the rear elevation of this attached dwelling, the rear extension would partly enclose the area just beyond its rear elevation and the development would be visible from both here and its ground floor windows. Having carefully viewed the back of No 39 from the site, I consider that the considerable depth and proximity of this new flank wall would cause it to dominate the outlook for and overbear on the occupiers of No 39. This would be most pronounced in views from the ground floor window of this neighbouring property and from its back garden. While existing vegetation along the shared rear boundary between Nos 39 and 41 would partially screen and visually soften the proposal to some extent, greenery cannot be relied on in these ways because it might be cut back or removed at any time.
8. In reaching these conclusions, I have had regard to the use of appropriate external materials. I also saw that several properties along Grosvenor Gardens include large rear extensions and considered the rear extensions at Nos 43, 45 and 47 and the plans provided by the appellant, which he says have been approved by the Council. Few other details have been provided and so I cannot be certain that the circumstances of these cases are the same or very similar to those of the appeal scheme. For instance, it is unclear whether these existing extensions were assessed in the light of the policies and guidance that apply in this instance. In any event, it is a key planning principle that each development should be assessed on its own merits, as I have done.
9. On the main issues, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. It would also materially reduce the living conditions of the occupiers of No 39. Accordingly, it conflicts with LP Policies LP26 and LP30 and the advice within the SPD. These policies and guidance promote high quality design and aim to ensure that all new development compliments the character of the building, respects the local character of the area and safeguards residential amenity.
10. Overall, the development conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the policies of the Framework 2024, which indicate that the decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR