



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2007

by **David J Rose** BSc Econ MA HonMRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for  
Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN  
☎ 0117 372 6372  
e-mail: [enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk)

Date: 10 April 2007

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/A/06/2031957**

**47 Leicester Road, Wanstead, London E11 2DW**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Vassallo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref 1683/06, dated 16 June 2006, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2006.
  - The development proposed is the construction of a new apartment building comprising of 6 two bed flats and 2 one bed flats.
- 

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Main Issues

2. These are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring residents and whether the proposal would offer a reasonable living environment for its occupiers.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is at the junction of Leicester Road and Gloucester Road. There is currently a single detached property on the site of different design from the properties adjoining in either road. It is proposed to clear the site and construct a new apartment building containing six 2 bed flats and two 1 bed flats.
  4. The local area is mainly characterised by semi detached or terraced houses that appear to date from the Victorian and Edwardian eras and have spacious rear gardens. The character of the estate is clearly well regarded by local residents as evidenced by the volume of comments made on this proposal.
  5. The proposed apartment building would have a similar height to No.45 Leicester Road and follow a similar building line, but, because of the density of the fenestration, the central gable feature, the basement level, and the dormers it would have a significantly greater scale. Moreover, it would present a rather bland, blank frontage to Gloucester Road.
  6. As a consequence, I take the view that the proposed apartment building would appear out of place and harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy BF 1 of the Redbridge Unitary Development Plan (UDP).
-

7. No.45 Leicester Road has windows in a living area/kitchen on the ground floor, a bathroom on the first floor and a second floor (attic) bedroom that overlook the appeal site. The proposal would lead to a loss of daylight and sunlight from the living area and the garden. No windows are proposed in the flank walls of the proposed new apartment building so no significant issue of overlooking arises. However, there would be intrusion and disturbance from access to the car parking and bin storage areas at the rear by the occupants of what would be 8 flats rather than the existing single dwelling at No.47. This would also have an impact on the occupiers of No.1 Gloucester Road. Taking these points together, I consider that the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers would be undermined to an unacceptable degree, contrary to Policy BF 11.
8. The appellants accept that there would be a shortfall in terms of the Council's amenity space standards set out in Policy ES 4. However, I have observed that there is significant recreational and open space within easy walk of the site. Occupiers of the proposed development could make use of that public open space and I can therefore conclude that they would have a reasonable living environment.
9. Although the proposal would provide a reasonable living environment for its occupiers, it would cause significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and to the character and appearance of the area. In my view, these latter points carry most weight. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*David J Rose*

INSPECTOR