



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2025

by **E Dade BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3362751

80 Finchingfield Avenue, Woodford Green, Redbridge IG8 7JR

- 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 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Yuan Ang Zheng against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 0287/25.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing extension and erection of single storey extension 6.0m deep incorporating flat roof with lantern light.
-

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 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO) for demolition of existing extension and erection of single storey extension 6.0m deep incorporating flat roof with lantern light at 80 Finchingfield Avenue, Woodford Green, Redbridge IG8 7JR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 0287/25, and the plans submitted with it including plan nos: 101 - *Existing Plans and Elevations*; 201REVISION - *Proposed Plans and Elevations*; 202 – *Sections and Views*; 801 - *Existing Block Plan*; 701 - *Block Plan Location Map*.

Preliminary Matters

2. The provisions of the GPDO, at Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A permit the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse. Development is permitted by Class A subject to the conditions and restrictions specified in paragraphs A.1, A.3, and A.4. My determination of the appeal has been made on this basis.
3. The GPDO does not require regard be had to the development plan. Rather, GPDO paragraph A.4(9) requires I take into account any representations made and consider the amenity of all adjoining premises.

Main Issue

4. The Council's assessment indicates the proposal would satisfy all requirements of Class A, except A.1(g) which specifies the maximum depth of the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse. Therefore, the main issue in this appeal is whether the development would accord with the provisions of Part 1, Class A of the GPDO, with particular regard to the limitations imposed by paragraph A.1(g).

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling within a rectangular plot. The surrounding area comprises a mid-20th century, suburban housing estate with dwellings of similar scale and form and a regular, uniform pattern of development. The appeal property is attached to no 78 and a modest gap from the side boundary provides separation from no 82.
6. A shed outbuilding is set back in the site beyond the appeal property's rear elevation and abutting the side boundary where it adjoins an outbuilding within the neighbouring plot. The outbuilding is constructed from brick with a simple, corrugated metal roof and is accessed from the front via a path next to the appeal property's side elevation.
7. Paragraph A.1(g) of the GPDO requires the proposed extension not exceed 4m in height and not extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse by more than 6m. As shown on the proposed plans and elevations, the proposed extension would be a maximum of 3.5m tall and would project 6m from the rear elevation.
8. As indicated on the proposed floor plans, the southeast corner of the extension would be immediately next to the outbuilding with only a minimal gap. However, the extension's side elevation would consist of a new cavity wall and the outbuilding would not comprise a part of the fabric of the extension.
9. The rear elevation drawing shows the parapet wall would intersect the outbuilding's roof material which overhangs the side wall. Whilst it is likely that alteration of the sheet metal roof would be required to accommodate the proposed extension, such works would be minor, unlikely to constitute development, and would not alter the outbuilding's form or function.
10. The proposed extension would have a flat roof, and the fascia board and guttering would project above the height of the outbuilding, as indicated by the section 2 drawing. Therefore, the extension and outbuilding would significantly differ in height and would not be attached at roof level.
11. The proposed extension would have a bifold door access to the rear garden, whereas the outbuilding faces forward and is accessed from the front garden. The extension would project beyond the front of the shed by only a relatively small distance and could not be connected via an internal door. Therefore, there would be no direct connectivity between the proposed extension and existing outbuilding.
12. Whilst the proposed rear extension would be very close to the outbuilding, they would be independent in both form and function. I am satisfied the outbuilding would remain a separate structure from the dwelling. For the purposes of the prior approval application, there is no compelling reason to combine the floorspace of the existing outbuilding with the depth of the proposed extension.
13. No representations were received from any adjoining owner or occupier notified by the Council or during the appeal.
14. The appeal property's rear garden is enclosed by tall, close boarded fences and mature vegetation. The existing outbuilding provides separation from no 80, and the proposed extension would be next to the blank side elevation of no 78's rear projection. The appeal property's rear garden is therefore well-enclosed by boundary treatments and built form. I have been provided no evidence that the

proposal would have an adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining owners or occupiers and have identified none myself.

15. In conclusion, the proposed development would not be on article 2(3) land and would not be on a site of special scientific interest. The proposed extension would be single storey, would not exceed 4m in height, and would not extend beyond the rear wall of the original semi-detached dwellinghouse by more than 6m. The proposal would satisfy paragraph A.1(g) and would therefore comply with the conditions of Class A.

Conditions

16. Planning permission granted for development under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO is subject to the conditions set out in paragraphs A.3 and A.4 of that Class. In summary, these require external materials be of a similar appearance to those used in construction of the exterior of the existing dwelling and provide details of written information required to be submitted before beginning the development. In addition, Article 4(2)(a) requires the development be completed within a period of 3 years starting with the prior approval date.

Conclusion

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

E Dade

INSPECTOR