The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by David Hogger BA MSc MRTPI MCIHT

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

Decision date: 13 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3159514
46 Darnley Road, Woodford Green IG8 9HY

- 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 Laurence Day against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
- The application Ref 2614/16, dated 2 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2016.
- The development proposed is a first floor front extension and roof alterations.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor front extension and roof alterations at 46 Darnley Road, Woodford Green IG8 9HY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2614/16, dated 2 June 2016, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

   (3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2563/PRO4 Rev A; 2563/PRO3 Rev A; 2563/PRO5 Rev A; 2563/EX02; 2563/EX03; 2563/EX04; 2563/EX05; 2563/EX00; and 2563/PRO1.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of the development as set out on the Decision Notice because it more accurately reflects the proposal as amended. For the avoidance of doubt the Council confirmed that the plans on which the decision was taken included three that had been amended but which had not been sent to the Planning Inspectorate with the submitted documentation. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the amended plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. There is a variety of architectural designs and styles in the vicinity of the appeal site. Bay windows are a prominent feature in the area, as are properties with hipped roofs which contribute to providing a level of spaciousness in the street scene. The proposed roof would be hipped and although it would continue the ridge line of the existing dwelling, I do not consider that it would significantly reduce the open space at roof level or appear overly dominant in the street scene as a whole. The bay windows would be retained (together with the attractive porch) and their dominance as architectural features would not be threatened by the proposed extension and roof alterations.

5. The first floor extension would be flush with the existing front wall of the dwelling, thus introducing what the Council considers to be 'a terracing effect' which would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. However, the appeal property and the adjoining dwelling (No48) already display some different visual characteristics and I saw other examples where the appearance of semi-detached dwellings is no longer fully balanced. Indeed there is also disparity in terms of the visual relationship between the appeal property and the adjacent dwelling (No44).

6. Of relevance is the fact that there is no current deviation in terms of the ground floor frontage of the property – the existing garage is flush with the remainder of the dwelling and would remain so. It would only be at first floor level that the existing 'recess' of about 1m would be lost. These circumstances mean that any consequent terracing effect, and lack of sub-ordination, would be minimal and the proposed development would not appear as a discordant feature in the street scene.

7. The National Planning Policy Framework emphasises the importance of achieving good design in the built environment and policies SP3 of the Redbridge Core Strategy, and BD1 and BD5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies DPD, echo that objective. They seek to ensure, for example, that development complements the character of the host building; does not dominate the existing building; and incorporates an appropriate roof profile. This proposal meets the policy requirements.

Conditions and Conclusion

8. The Council suggests three conditions including the standard time condition. A condition requiring development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty and a condition requiring the use of appropriate materials is required in order to ensure that the appearance of the development would be acceptable. I impose all three conditions.

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

David Hogger

Inspector