



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3366650

90 Torquay Gardens, Redbridge IG4 5PT

- 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 Maqsood Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
- The application ref is 0124/25.
- The development proposed is the demolition of a garage and construction of a single storey rear and two storey side / part first floor rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of a garage and construction of a single storey rear and two storey side / part first floor rear extension at 90 Torquay Gardens, Ilford, IG4 5PT in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 0124/25, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Location Plan, DWGGF002 2 (proposed ground floor plan), DWGFF002 2 (proposed first floor plan) DWGRE002 2 (proposed front elevation) DWGRE002 2 (proposed rear elevation), DWGBP002 2 (proposed block plan), DWGDR002 2 (proposed roof plan), DWGSE002 2 (proposed side elevations).
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Prior to first occupation/use of the first floor bathroom a window shall be fitted with obscure glass and be non opening up to 1.7 metres above the internal floor level and retained thereafter. Details of the glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to installation which shall be in accordance with the approved details.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. I note there is a discrepancy between the original description of the development as shown on the planning application form and that used by the Council on the

decision notice. I have taken the description of the development in the banner heading above from the Council's decision notice, as it provides a more concise description of the proposal, which I note the appellant has also adopted with the Grounds of Appeal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance on the host dwelling and surrounding area and b) living conditions for the occupants of the neighbouring property at 88 Torquay Gardens with particular regard to outlook, light and privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a two storey, semi detached dwelling with a detached single garage situated within a suburban residential area. It is set back from the road in a wedge shaped plot on the bend of Torquay Gardens. It has a wider rear garden than many of the other properties in the area and backs onto a woodland. The surrounding area is characterised by terraced and semi detached dwellings with a general coherence in terms of appearance, although many of the dwellings have been altered and/or extended to the side and/or, rear and have loft conversions resulting in a degree of variation in the built form.
6. The proposal is an amended scheme following an earlier refusal of permission (application reference (P0460/24) for 'demolition of a detached garage and construction of a single storey rear and two storey side extension'.
7. The Council appears to raise no objection to the proposed two storey side and part first floor rear extension in terms of impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. I too find this element of the proposal acceptable as it would mirror the two storey extension that has occurred at the attached dwelling at 92 Torquay Gardens and would therefore balance the appearance of the semi detached dwellings and provide a degree of symmetry. It would not appear incongruous within the street scene or harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. The London Borough of Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2019 refers to guidelines for single storey extensions. In general, it is expected that single storey rear extensions do not dominate the host dwelling or project too far into the garden from the original rear wall of the dwelling.
9. The Council are concerned about the depth of the rear extension which would not accord with the guidelines in the SPD. The SPD recognises that a depth greater than the guidelines will only be acceptable where they would be consistent with the adjoining properties.
10. Whilst the extension would exceed the guidelines, it would only extend marginally beyond the depth of the existing conservatory which is proposed to be demolished. The extension would have a greater depth than that of the rear extension for the neighbouring dwelling at 92 Torquay Gardens.
11. Given the extent of the rear garden, the extension would not convey a sense of overdevelopment of the plot or appear cramped in its setting. As a single storey addition, it would be subservient to the scale and form of the existing dwelling and

would not appear disproportionate or incongruous within the context of the rear garden setting.

12. I observed during my site visit that there is a single track which separates the site boundary with no.88 and a high close boarded panel fencing on the boundary. The extension would retain adequate distance of separation to the boundary with the track. Given the existing boundary treatment, the single storey rear extension would not result in a loss of privacy. The proposed first floor window serving the bathroom facing towards no.88 would be frosted glazing with restricted opening, adequately mitigating any loss of privacy impact. This could be secured by a condition.
13. I have had regard to the Council's concerns regarding the overbearing impact and overshadowing of no.88. However, given the orientation, relationship of the dwellings and that a reasonable separation distance would remain between the appeal dwelling and the neighbouring property any overbearing or overshadowing caused by the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions for occupants of no.88.
14. Consequently, the proposal would not conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (March 2018) which seek high quality design in all developments which integrates and respects the surrounding area, compliments the character of the building and does not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

15. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
16. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, a condition requiring the external materials of the extension to match those used in the existing building is imposed.
17. A condition relating to the use of obscure glazing to the bathroom window is necessary to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR