

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

**by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC**

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

**Decision date: 06 March 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3164644**

**70 Malford Grove, South Woodford, London E18 2DY**

- 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 Kunal Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref 4122/16, dated 26 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2016.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey front extension incorporating new front porch, single and part double storey side and rear extension, conversion of garage into habitable room.
- 

### Procedural matters

1. Planning permission was granted on 5 August 2016 ref 2733/16 at the appeal site to "demolish side garage and adjoining structures; single storey front extension with a pergola; construct a 2 storey side and rear extension with a part pitched and hip roof construction, replace existing windows". I observed that work on this permission had commenced on site.
2. This appeal is related to another at the same address ref APP/W5780/D/16/3164735 for which there is a separate decision.

### Decision

3. I dismiss the appeal.

### Application for costs

4. An application for costs was made by Mr Kunal Patel against the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### Main Issues

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

6. No 70 is a semi-detached house located in a predominantly residential area. This proposal seeks to amend planning permission ref. 2733/16 by proposing a gabled roof to the approved side extension in place of the approved hipped
-

roof. The appellant pointed out that a gable roof was considered best suited for the dormer loft conversion works that have been carried out as it would be similar to the gable wall already constructed.

7. I note the Council's opinion that the proposal would not harmfully change the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings in respect of overlooking, overshadowing and loss of outlook, and from my assessment I have no reason to disagree. However, the Council raised concerns regarding the effect of the proposed side extension with a gabled roof on the street scene.
8. While there are examples of gabled roofs to be found in the locality, including at the neighbouring dwelling (no. 72), I consider that that hipped roofs are a feature of the area and contribute strongly to its character and local distinctiveness. In my judgement, the proposal would introduce an addition that would not sit well with the host building in terms of the overall effect it would have on the bulk and massing of the side extension. It would result in the side extension failing to be materially subordinate to the original house and would mean that it would be at odds with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. Furthermore, it would have a visually unbalancing effect on the pair of semi-detached houses when viewed from Malford Grove, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street-scene. Accordingly, due to its scale and siting, the proposal would be a prominent and incongruous addition that would run counter to seeking to reinforce local distinctiveness.
10. It would therefore conflict with Policies BD1 and BD5 of the Council's adopted Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 (which require proposals, inter alia, to be compatible with and contribute to the distinctive character of the area in which they are located and seek extensions that do not dominate existing buildings) and the broad aims of Policy SP3 of the adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document and Policy 7.4 of the adopted London Plan.
11. I note that planning permission has been granted for similar forms of side extension in the general area over recent years and others have been erected utilising permitted development rights. In addition, the appellant referred to several previous appeal decisions in the Borough wherein planning permission was granted for developments claimed to be similar. However, I do not have the site specific details taken into consideration by those Inspectors. In any event, each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits having regard to its particular design, context and circumstances.
12. In which case, these considerations along with my finding that the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, would not outweigh the harm the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area.

**Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above, and noting the appellant's frustration with how the Council handled the application and the letters in support at the application stage, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Richard McCoy*

INSPECTOR