
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2016

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3152869

349b and 349c Chigwell Road, Woodford Green, Essex IG8 9PE

- 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 Paul Robbins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4867/15, dated 9 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, reconfiguration of the roof to include hip to gable, two rear dormers and rooms in the roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension, reconfiguration of the roof to include hip to gable, two rear dormers and rooms in the roof at 349b and 349c Chigwell Road, Woodford Green, Essex IG8 9PE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 4867/15, dated 9 December 2015, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1026-01A; 1026-05 and 1:1250 site location plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is a detached two storey building on the corner of Chigwell Road and Broadmead Road. Externally the building has an appearance of a house, but internally it contains two flats. Access to the ground floor flat is from Broadmead Road whilst the first floor flat is accessed from Chigwell Road. The front and flank boundaries of the site contain mature landscaping, which together with street trees in the grass verge along Chigwell Road, provide a strong visual screen of the site. Adjacent to the site is a terrace containing 349
-

to 355 Chigwell Road. A hipped roof is used for the terrace and the appeal site; however the ridge line of the terrace is higher. Gable roofs are used in properties in Hookstone Way and Underwood Road. A number of these properties visibly back onto Chigwell Road and have a staggered building line.

4. Even though the site is on a corner, I do not share the Council's view that it is overly prominent given the set back from Chigwell Road and presence of landscaping on and off the site. Whereas the properties on Hookstone Way and Underwood Road which back onto Chigwell Road are not so well screened and due to their respective siting form a more prominent part of the street scene than the appeal site in my opinion.
5. The proposal would increase the height, bulk and massing of the property especially though the proposed roof alterations which includes a hip to gable extension on both sides. Although this would result in a different design to the adjacent terrace, the gable roof forms would reflect properties on Hookstone Way and Underwood Road. I recognise that these properties are smaller, but the proposed ridge height is consistent with the adjacent terrace which I consider to be an important aspect to retain. Accordingly, the scale and design of the proposed roof alterations would broadly assimilate into the local character and respect the pattern of development in the area.
6. Although there are a range of public vantage points of the site, existing landscaping currently screens the majority of the property from view. As the landscaping is not protected some would be lost through the construction of the two storey side extension which would adjoin the splayed flank boundary of the site. The site would as a result become more visible, despite the subordinate side extension. However this would be tempered by the retention of the exiting landscaping to the front of the site and glazing in the flank elevation that would add interest.
7. Given the rear dormers are both subordinate features in the roof plane, well-spaced and set beneath the ridge line, I concur with the Council that they are of acceptable design and appearance. The proposal would improve the existing accommodation in each flat. Even though this in itself is not a pivotal factor, high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would comply with Policy SP3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policies BD1 and BD5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document. These policies together seek development to be of a style, massing, scale and design that contributes to local distinctiveness and does not dominate the roof plane.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. I have regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition is necessary relating to matching materials to ensure the extensions harmonise with the site's character and appearance.
10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR