



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3364534

52 Glenwood Gardens, Ilford IG2 6XU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sadiqur Rahman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 0652/25.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing rear extension and erection of single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for demolition of existing rear extension and erection of single-storey rear extension at 52 Glenwood Gardens, Ilford IG2 6XU, in accordance with the application Ref 0652/25, and the plans submitted with it: Location plan; 2024/52/Rear/01; 2024/52/Rear/02; 2024/52/Rear/03; 2024/52/Rear/04.

Preliminary Matters

2. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO, planning permission is granted for certain enlargements of a dwellinghouse, subject to specific limitations and conditions.
3. Where objections are received from neighbouring properties, the local planning authority must assess the proposal solely in terms of its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises. In this case, an objection was received on behalf of the occupier of 50 Glenwood Gardens (No 50), raising various concerns including about loss of light, outlook, and privacy. The Council subsequently refused prior approval. Based on the evidence and my site visit, I am satisfied that my considerations in this appeal are limited to the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 50.

Main Issue

4. In light of the above, the main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 50, with regard to outlook, light, and privacy.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey end-of-terrace house located on the southern side of Glenwood Gardens. It has a long rear garden enclosed by fencing approximately 2 metres high.
6. The proposal seeks to replace an existing 3 metre deep single-storey extension at the rear with a new flat-roofed extension projecting 6 metres from the original rear wall, and a maximum height at the boundary of 3.2 metres.
7. The existing extension already effects the outlook from the rear ground floor windows of No 50 to some extent. While the new extension would project a further 3 metres, its height would not be significantly greater than that of the existing boundary fence and vegetation. Furthermore, it would occupy only a limited proportion of the overall length of the shared boundary, preserving a largely open and spacious rear aspect. As such, the extension would not appear overbearing or significantly enclose the neighbouring garden.
8. Given the orientation of the properties and the modest height of the extension, any additional loss of light to the ground floor windows and garden of No 50 would be minimal and not materially harmful.
9. Additionally, as no side facing windows are proposed, there would be no loss of privacy.
10. For all these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 50 in terms of outlook, light, or privacy.

Other Matters

11. I have noted the concern raised about noise and disruption during construction, particularly given the age and vulnerability of the neighbouring resident. While these concerns are understandable, they fall outside the scope of matters that can be considered under the prior approval process, which is limited to the impact of the development on amenity once completed. However, I would encourage the appellant to liaise with their neighbour in advance of construction and to take all reasonable steps to minimise disruption.

Conditions

12. Certain requirements of development as proposed here are already set out in the GPDO and it is therefore unnecessary to repeat them in conditions. Paragraph A.4 (11) in particular specifies that the development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details (which in this case are principally shown on the drawings).

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and prior approval should be granted.

A Caines

INSPECTOR