



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2025

by **Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3373333

56 Malford Grove, South Woodford, London E18 2DY

- 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 Mrs Salma Khodabaksh against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref is 1964/25.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, and upon the living conditions of the occupants of 58 Malford Grove, with specific reference to outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling that has been extended significantly in the past with its rear elevation largely subsumed by the previous extensions, this is particularly apparent bearing in mind that 58 Malford Grove adjoining, is as originally built, aside from a modest conservatory.
4. There are many examples of houses that have been enlarged within the locality and the appeal site does benefit from a generous rear garden area, however, having regard to the Council's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in paragraph 3.3.1 it states that the depth of a first floor extension should generally be kept to a maximum of 3m and will need to have regard to the 45° rule.
5. In terms of depth, the extension would be in compliance with the SPD and in plan form alone, as identified on the submitted Proposed First Floor Plan, the extension would not conflict with a 45° line when drawn from the nearest first floor window on the rear of no 58.
6. However, the SPD goes on to state that with regard to position and width, the first-floor element should generally be no more than half the width of the original rear elevation i.e. 50%, to ensure that it is proportionate and subordinate to the host property and minimises impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours.
7. It is common ground that in totality the rear extensions would occupy 88% of the overall width of the main dwelling thereby demonstrating that they would not be

subordinate in form. In terms of height and roof design, the SPD states that the roof of an extension should match that of the original house, clearly being of a flat design this would not be the case.

8. Overall, I consider that the proposed extension, in combination with those that have preceded it would be poorly designed and lack subordination to the original dwelling with it being visually dominant within the rear garden scene.
9. I therefore find the proposal not only conflicts with the SPD, but also Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Council's Local Plan which stipulate that the Council will seek high quality design in all development within the Borough and that a development of poor design that does not take available opportunities to improve an area's character and quality will be refused planning permission; and with specific reference to household extensions development should complement the character of the building, and be subordinate in terms of size and scale, incorporating a roof profile sympathetic to the existing dwelling. The proposal also conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') which stipulates that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

Living Conditions

10. As identified above, the proposed first floor plan shows that a 45° line taken from the nearest first floor window of no58 would not be conflicted. However, the SPD clearly shows that this must also be in elevation whereby a 45° line is drawn upwards from the centre of the nearest ground floor habitable room windows of an adjoining property; and that the elevation of the proposed extension should fit within this area, as demonstrated within figure 7a as set out therein. It has not been demonstrated to me that the proposal would comply with this rule and an annotation of the proposed rear elevation within the Council's Officer Report, shows that a 45° line taken from the side elevation of the proposed extension would go beyond the mid-point of no58's patio doors.
11. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would give rise to a material loss of daylight and outlook not only from these windows, but also within the immediate rear sitting out area of the neighbouring property. I accept that in isolation overshadowing (from sunlight) may be time limited, however, that does not negate the effects upon daylight and outlook. Again, in addition to the proposal conflicting with the SPD it also conflicts with LP Policies LP26 and LP30 which together require proposals to not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in relation to daylight/ sunlight and outlook. Furthermore, I find conflict between the proposal and the Framework in paragraph 135. f) that requires planning decisions to ensure that developments create a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

12. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR