



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2025

by **D Ellis MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd of July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/25/3362250

575 Green Lane, Seven Kings, Ilford, Redbridge IG3 9RJ

- 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 M Mayet of Aeternum Global Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 1442/24.
 - The development is single storey detached outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The outbuilding has already been constructed, and I am therefore dealing with this appeal retrospectively. I have also removed 'retrospective' and 'retention' from the description of development in the header above as these are not terms of development.

Background and Main Issues

3. Planning permission was previously granted to demolish an existing single-storey structure and to construct a two-storey property containing four flats¹. At the time of my site visit, the two-storey building had been largely constructed with internal works ongoing. A detached outbuilding had been also erected which was not included on the approved plans, and planning permission is now sought for this outbuilding.
4. Therefore, the main issues are a) the effect of the outbuilding on the character and appearance of the area; b) whether the development would create adequate living conditions for future occupiers of the flats, with particular regards to privacy, outlook, external amenity space and cycle storage; and c) the effect of the outbuilding on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with particular regards to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is situated within a predominantly residential area. The surrounding dwellings have medium-sized gardens, many of which contain outbuildings of varying sizes. Whilst some of the outbuildings are large in scale, a

¹ Planning application ref. 0036/22

significant amount of usable garden space is retained which contributes to a pleasing sense of spaciousness between the properties that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The new outbuilding is to the rear of the block of flats and has very limited visibility from public vantage points. However, the outbuilding is subject to private views from the surrounding properties that back on to each other.
7. Paragraph 3.8.1 of the Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) states that outbuildings should not impact on the open character of the garden or the surrounding area.
8. Although the outbuilding is used for storage and thus is ancillary to the main building, it spans the whole width of the plot and is situated close to the block of flats with only a limited area of amenity space remaining. As such, the outbuilding does not respond positively to the existing pattern of development as it appears cramped in the plot. The size of the outbuilding and the block of flats, and combined with the lack of space between them, is detrimental to the sense of spaciousness between the surrounding properties. As a result, the outbuilding integrates poorly with the built form of the surrounding area.
9. Although the new outbuilding appears to be of a similar size and location to the previously demolished structure, the previous structure was the only building on the site with the whole of the area to the front of the structure contributing to the sense of openness.
10. For these reasons, the cramped appearance of the outbuilding would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) (LP), insofar as they require development to be well integrated and respect the surrounding area and local character, including with regards to its scale and layout.

Living conditions of future occupiers

11. There would be a small separation between the outbuilding and the rear doors and windows of the ground floor flats. At such close proximity and given its height and massing, the outbuilding would significantly restrict the outlook from these doors and windows. Although the previous approval would have resulted in a 1.8-metre-high fence in close proximity to these doors and windows, the outbuilding is significantly taller and wider than the fence would have been. Overall, the outbuilding would result in a materially harmful enclosing and overbearing effect to the future occupiers of the ground floor flats.
12. The windows in the outbuilding face towards the rear doors and windows of the ground floor flats. However, the outbuilding would be used for storage and not as habitable accommodation, and as such there would not be any significant loss of privacy to the occupiers of the ground floor flats.
13. As a result of the construction of the outbuilding, there are not any private garden areas for the flats. However, LP Policy LP29 states that external private and/or communal amenity space should be provided and seeks a minimum of 5 square metres of communal space per unit for flatted developments. The outdoor communal amenity space is 47 square metres which satisfies this requirement and

would of a sufficient size for everyday use when typical garden paraphernalia and associated uses for the four flats are taken into account.

14. Although no provision for cycle storage is shown on the submitted drawings, the outbuilding would comfortably accommodate the required cycle storage. A condition could secure appropriate cycle storage.
15. The development has resulted in adequate outdoor amenity space and appropriate cycle storage could be secured. The outbuilding therefore accords with LP Policies LP26, LP29 and LP30, insofar as they require development to provide satisfactory external communal amenity space to meet the needs of occupants, to be functional and to be “fit for purpose” in terms of the particular building it serves. The development also accords with LP Policy LP23 and Policy T5 of the London Plan (2021), which require development to provide appropriate cycle parking.
16. However, the outbuilding would cause harm to future occupiers of the ground floor flats through a lack of outlook. The outbuilding therefore conflicts with LP Policy LP30, insofar as it requires development to maintain an acceptable outlook from surrounding dwellings.

Living conditions of neighbouring residents

17. The outbuilding is situated at the rear of the site and is adjacent to the rearmost parts of the surrounding gardens, and as such is positioned away from the surrounding dwellings. The outbuilding is single-storey and has a flat-roof which limits its height above the existing boundary treatments. The outbuilding is also in close proximity to other outbuildings which lessens the visual impact of the outbuilding from neighbouring gardens. For these reasons the outbuilding has not caused a significant loss of outlook, sense of enclosure or overbearing effect to neighbouring residents.
18. The submitted documents show that the outbuilding is to be used for storage and not as habitable accommodation. Furthermore, a further planning application would be required to use the outbuilding as a separate dwelling. As such, the use of the outbuilding would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents as a result of noise.
19. The development therefore accords with LP Policies LP26 and LP30, insofar as they require development to not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in relation to outlook and noise.

Conclusion

20. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Ellis

INSPECTOR