



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3369973

32 Horn Lane, Woodford Green IG8 9AD

- 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 Ray Bailey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application reference is 0546/25.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a ground floor extension to replace garage, enclose the front porch and provide a downstairs bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The proposed development is complete. Planning permission is, therefore, sought retrospectively.
3. An interested party raises concern that some details shown on the plans are incorrect and that the windows of an adjacent property are omitted. Reference is also made to the lack of an assessment of light to support the planning application. I have taken these concerns into account in my assessment of the development, which is based on all the submitted evidence and an inspection of the site and the surroundings. On that basis, I am satisfied that the details of the appeal scheme as shown on the drawings, and as set out in the written evidence, allow a reasonable assessment of the development sought.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 34 Horn Lane, with regard to outlook and sense of enclosure and on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

Background

5. The appeal scheme comprises a ground floor extension that wraps around the front and side of the main house. The Council has recently granted planning permission for a similar form of development, which is hereafter referred to as the approved scheme. Compared to the approved scheme, the extension, as built, has a hipped roof and the sidewall is taller and extends further forward of the main house to align with the front of the new porch. According to the appellant, these changes were

necessary primarily to avoid an awkward gutter detail with the recently completed 2-storey extension at the side of the adjacent property, which is 34 Horn Lane.

Living conditions

6. The sidewall of the extension projects noticeably forward of the front wall of No 34. As a result, an expanse of brickwork would be visible at close range from the ground floor front window of No 34 nearest to the site that appears to serve a habitable room. Due to its height, forward projection and proximity to the boundary with No 34, the sidewall would visually dominate the outlook from and unduly heighten a sense of enclosure when seen from this window. That the sidewall of the extension breaches a line drawn at 45-degrees from the centre of the window reinforces my view regarding the harmful impact on the occupiers of No 34 caused by the appeal scheme.
7. I note the appellant's view that the sidewall is only 300mm higher than its approved counterpart, which the Council and an interested party contest. Either way, the height and position of the sidewall, as built, causes it to loom over the window given that No 32 occupies an elevated position relative to No 34 due to the gently sloping ground. The difference in local ground levels accentuates the visual impact of the sidewall when seen from No 34. When seen from this neighbouring property, the top of the sidewall broadly aligns with the cill of the first-floor window of No 34. In that context, the difference in height of the sidewall, as approved and as constructed, could not reasonably be described as 'de minimus' in terms of its effect on the living conditions of others.
8. On the first issue, I conclude that the development causes significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 34. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP) and Policy D3 of The London Plan (TLP) insofar as they aim to safeguard residential amenity. It is also at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that development should create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Character and appearance

9. A larger building has resulted from the appeal scheme with a front and side addition that is a prominent feature of the host building when seen from the road. Nevertheless, the extension has been designed to broadly complement the form, scale and design of the existing house. It is a subordinate addition to the host building with appropriate external materials and a hipped roof that is in keeping with the architectural style of the existing dwelling. When viewed from Horn Lane, the main 2-storey house remains clearly legible with the new built form in place.
10. Within the local area I saw that 2-storey semi-detached dwellings predominate and that several properties close to the site have ground floor projections that extend forward of the main front wall. In that varied context, the extension is not overly large, bulky, obtrusive nor is it an uncharacteristic feature of the local area. By complementing the intrinsic character of the host building and respecting the character and qualities of the local area, the extension is not incongruous.
11. On the second main issue, I conclude that the development does not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building or the local area. As such, it does not conflict with LP Policies LP26 and LP30 or TLP Policy

D3, which aim to ensure that household extensions complement the character of the building and respect the local context. This favourable finding does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified in relation to the first main issue.

Other matters

12. The extension provides accommodation and facilities to enable an elderly person to continue to live an active life in her home. I am sympathetic to this desire, but personal circumstances seldom outweigh more general planning considerations. In this case, the extension is likely to subsist for many years to come.
13. The site is not within a conservation area nor is No 32 a listed building. I note the appellant's view that the approved development is lower in quality than the 'as built' version and that the appeal scheme overcomes an uneasy gutter arrangement with No 34, as extended. However, these considerations do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.
14. The Officer's report and an interested party raise an additional objection in relation to the effect of the development on light. This is an important consideration, and I have considered all the submitted evidence. However, given my findings on the first main issue, this is not a matter that has been critical to my decision.

Conclusion

15. Overall, the appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
16. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR