



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3372010

82 Brisbane Road, Redbridge, Ilford IG1 4SL

- 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 Thomas Mouldsdales against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 0868/25.
 - The development is the extension of existing one storey kitchen replacing existing lean to extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension of existing one storey kitchen replacing existing lean to extension, at 82 Brisbane Road, Redbridge, Ilford IG1 4SL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 0868/25, subject to the condition set out below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: EX PR Ground Floor Plan GA001; Rear Elevation GA021; Side Elevation GA022; and Rear Elev and Sect GA041.

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 Matters

3. During my site visit, I observed a development which appeared the same as that shown on the plans. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis that planning permission is sought to retain the development that has been constructed and for clarity, based on what is shown on the plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 84 Brisbane Road with particular regard to sunlight/daylight and outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling aligned on a south-east to north-east axis. The land slopes down towards Valentines Park, resulting in stepped ridge heights and gardens along the terrace. Rear elevations feature two-storey outriggers and long, narrow gardens descending the slope. Adjacent to the

appeal property, No 84 includes a rear infill extension with wide patio doors and three rooflights, positioned between its outrigger and that of No 82.

6. There is an existing permission at the site¹ for a building of 3 metres (m) in height at the shared boundary which the Council has not found to conflict with the development plan. Furthermore, there has previously been a lean to at the appeal site which the Council accepts is not dissimilar in scale and massing to the existing permission.
7. The appellant has provided an annotated plan (GA041) confirming that the height of the building at the shared boundary is 2.96m. Notwithstanding that the rear garden of No 84 sits at a noticeably lower level than that of No 82, with the consequence that the wall appears considerably taller when viewed from No 84, the Council previously found a 3m development at the shared boundary to be acceptable. It therefore follows that the appeal scheme wall at the shared boundary is similarly acceptable because it does not exceed the previously approved height. Even taking into account the modest increase in height at the end of the wall on the shared boundary created by the addition of a parapet, this is not a significant visual change, and no adverse harm arises to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 84, who maintain an appropriate level of outlook and daylight/sunlight.
8. Accordingly, the development is not harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 84, with particular regard to sunlight/daylight and outlook and accords with the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) Policies LP26 and LP30 and The London Plan (2021) Policy D3, insofar as they seek to avoid adverse impacts upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in regard to daylight/sunlight and outlook.

Conditions

9. Given the development has been constructed, it is not necessary to impose the standard time condition or a materials condition. However, in the interest of clarity it is necessary to impose a plans condition that includes reference to drawing GA041 which shows the height of the development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

F Harrison

INSPECTOR

¹ Ref: 0123/22