



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2025

by **H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3361439

46 Crownfield Avenue, Newbury Park, Ilford, IG2 7RR

- 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 Imdadul Haque against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 3062/24.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension measuring 6m length, 6m wide, 3m high.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The address of the appeal property varies slightly between the documents, and with the omission of reference to 'Redbridge', I have used that given on the original planning application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (1) the character and appearance of the dwelling and area; and (2) the living conditions of occupants of 48 Crownfield Avenue, with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is an end-terrace dwelling which is also attached to a neighbouring terraced house, 44 Crownfield Avenue (No.44) by a single storey element built up to the shared boundary. The residential character and appearance of the street scene appears reasonably consistent as a result of the original design, form and construction period of dwellings, but many properties have been extended. The range of alterations is greater at the rear, and there are numerous single-storey rear extensions within the vicinity of the appeal site, including a deep addition at No.44.
5. Policy LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (LP) supports householder extensions which complement the character of the building in matters including scale and form, and which are subordinate to the existing building in terms of size, scale or height. This is supported by the Council's 'Housing Design' Supplementary Planning Document 2019, which advises that the depth of a single-storey rear

extension on an end-terrace house should be limited to 3.5m, partly to ensure that it does not dominate the host or original property. The proposal would span the full width of the main dwelling for a considerable depth. In terms of footprint, it would be excessive in scale and disproportionate to the host house, and this would not be mitigated by the subordinate height and use of high quality materials. It would appear as an unacceptably dominant addition to the property, and would undermine its character, and to a lesser extent, that of the wider area.

6. The appeal site is deep enough to accommodate the proposal without it appearing disproportionate to the site, but this would not override the effect on the host building.
7. I am mindful that there is a single-storey rear extension of similar depth at No.44, but this appears to be the exception in the vicinity, with most rear extensions being more modest in depth. No details for the development at No.44 have been supplied. As such, the circumstances of its construction are not known, nor if it was built prior to the adoption of the Council's current policies and guidance. The appellant advises that it has existed without enforcement action and is an indication that the Council accepts such developments as part of the character of the area. However, as extensions of this size are not prevalent in the locality, on the basis of the evidence supplied I am not persuaded that the development at No.44 justifies acceptance of the appeal proposal.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property, and in so doing, the character of the area. This would be contrary to LP Policy LP30, and LP Policy LP26, which amongst other criteria seeks high quality design which respects the local character of the area, and makes a positive architectural and urban design contribution to its context and location, and is well integrated and has regard to and respect for the surrounding area in terms including form, scale, and design.

Living Conditions

9. The attached property, 48 Crownfield Avenue (No.48), has a single-storey rear projection set away from the boundary with the appeal property, and openings facing the garden set back in the original rear elevation. Although there is already a wall and fencing between the two properties, the proposed extension would be materially higher and deeper alongside the boundary. Whilst I accept that the proposed height may be consistent with other extensions in the vicinity, the combination of this height and depth would result in an undue sense of enclosure for current and future occupants of No.48, and would dominate the outlook from the existing rear-facing openings closest to the proposal. I agree with the appellant's view that there is already a moderate level of mutual overbearing and enclosure between neighbouring properties, but being larger than extensions typically found in the area, the proposal would have more impact.
10. The appellant has made a comparison with the extension at No.44. However, its effect on the appeal property is reduced by the depth of the appellant's own garage/rooms next to the boundary. As noted above, as the majority of extensions are much shallower than proposed in this case, they do not justify acceptance of the effect that would arise in this case.
11. I appreciate that no objections to the proposal were submitted by neighbouring residents at the application stage. Nevertheless, as occupants and their opinions

change over time, it is appropriate to secure by design reasonable living conditions for all current and future residents.

12. The appellant has referred to the Council's assessment of the effect on daylight and sunlight enjoyed by the neighbour. However, although mentioned in the Council's delegated report, this is not included in the formal decision. Whilst the proposal could have some impact in late afternoon, I do not consider that this would be so significant as to cause material harm. However, this does not alter my conclusion in respect of the effect on outlook.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in an increased sense of enclosure and diminish the outlook for occupants of 48 Crownfield Avenue to a degree that living conditions would be harmed. This would be contrary to LP Policies LP26 and LP30, which together seek to ensure that development does not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in matters including outlook.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR