
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by David L Morgan BA MA (T&CP) MA (Bld Con IoAAS) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 27th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3167218

88 Uplands Road, Woodford Green IG8 8JW

- 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 Jon Jones against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4867/16, dated 13 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is rear extension to ground and first floor. Roof extension with installation of rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part two storey side extension with roof over existing flat roof of existing two storey side extension. Part single, part two storey rear extension. Loft conversion with rear dormer incorporating Juliette balcony and three front rooflights. Front porch at 88 Uplands Road, Woodford Green IG8 8JW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 4867/16, dated 13 October 2016, 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: Location Plan, 15038/001, 15038/010A, 15038/020A, 15038/210M, 15038/211K, 15038/220K, 15038/221J & 15038/222K .
 - 3) 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.
 - 4) Prior to the commencement of development details, including scale drawings 1:50 showing the detailed arrangement of the window/front door at ground floor and porch on the front elevation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The subsequent works shall be carried out in accordance with the details thereby approved and retained as such thereafter.

Procedural matters

2. The description of development set out in the formal decision is different to that set out in the template above, which is taken from the planning application

form. As the former is that used both by the Council in their officer Report and decision notice, and is the one adopted by the appellant in their appeal form and Grounds for Appeal, and as it more accurately describes the development proposed, I have applied it in the formal decision.

3. There are minor discrepancies in the plans in relation to the detailed treatment of the ground floor front elevation and the provision of a porch in this location. The appellant advises that the porch is an element of the proposal that could be undertaken under permitted development rights and has therefore not included elevational details as part of the proposal drawings. Council on the other hand asserts that as the porch is included within the proposals they have treated them as part of the planning application.
4. As things stand, these two matters remain unresolved in the appeal documents. Whilst it may be the case that such works are indeed lawful development, in order that these matters are capable of resolution with regard to these proposals, I have attached a condition requiring the submission of details of these outstanding matters. As the Council anticipate the submission of amended details in the future, and any clarity on the lawfulness of the works would necessitate further submissions from the appellant, I do not consider such a condition to be unreasonable or one that will come as a surprise to either party.

Main Issues

5. These are a) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and b) its effect on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers with respect to outlook.

Reasons

6. Uplands Road is a long linear avenue comprised of generally regularly grouped terraces of six dwellings. These present a lively and characterful elevation to the street with three timbered gables facing the road shared by each pair of dwellings beneath. The remainder of each dwelling is set back behind the projecting gable bays, presenting a secondary element of the elevation to the road. There are gaps and spaces between the terraces but these are irregular, reflecting the lateral extensions of some of the dwellings. There is an access road to the rear gardens of the dwellings and those in Canfield Road but views here are limited by planting, garages and garden structures.
7. The balance and composure of the front elevation of the dwellings is not matched on the rear, where there are a multitude of rear extensions and roof dormers as the individual houses have been altered and extended over the years. This is most spectacularly evidenced by the rear addition at roof level of the adjacent No. 86, which has a truly enormous extension running the full width of the roof, terminating just above the eaves and finishing just below the ridge of main roof. This addition is supplemented with a further single storey ground floor extension to the rear again the full width of the building.
8. As the detailed description of development identifies, the proposals comprise a range of elements including additional roof space over the existing flat roofed addition, a rear ground floor extension, first floor extension and a rear roof dormer. The addition to the roof extends the existing secondary roof over the flat roofed extension with a full hip at the end and a gabled projecting wing to

the rear sitting above the full width flat roofed rear extension. The flat roofed dormer projects to the rear between the proposed wing and the adjacent property (No. 90).

Effect on character and appearance

9. For ease of reference I consider the several components of the proposal in the same manner as the Council as they set them out in the delegated report.
10. It is the case that the ridge of the proposed roof over the existing extension is not set down below that of the existing section of roof. But this is itself a secondary component of the roof structure which is subservient to the main transverse gable. Moreover, to drop the ridge would mean altering the pitch, so creating a further fragmented element to the roof structure. Moreover, the end of the roof is hipped, thus avoiding any significant 'terracing effect' with the adjacent property. Even if this could be argued, in my view the benefits of resolving the flat roofed element of the structure as it faces the street would significantly mitigate this outcome.
11. The second storey extension is carried through to the rear terminating with a gable to the wing. This in my view is an articulate response to the resolution of the roof to the front, and presents a gabled structure to the rear with an architectural rather than utilitarian presence. It would project no further than the adjacent property's rear additions and would be considerably more well-mannered as a result.
12. The ground floor rear flat roofed extension would indeed span the full width of the dwelling and project somewhere in the region of 6.2m from the rear elevation. This is by most standards a substantial addition to a dwelling of this type. However, it would do no more than consolidate the line of such similar rear extensions on each of the flanking properties, and could not be argued to be either 'disproportionate' or 'out of character' in this context. Moreover, the first floor wing projecting above the extension, serves to visually integrate the whole within the envelope of the dwelling giving the whole a degree of architectural cohesion.
13. The rear dormer, with its flat roof and boxy form would undoubtedly be read as such in the limited views of the property from the rear lane and dwellings beyond. However, a very similar structure has been acknowledged as lawful development by the Council previously, and is acknowledged to be a 'fall-back' option by them accordingly. In my view the likelihood of its implementation in these terms is of limited relevance here, more significantly however, is the acknowledgement that such a structure could quite lawfully be erected, and this is a matter of significantly greater weight in favour of the proposals in the consideration of them.
14. Moreover, an assessment of the surrounding roofscape attests to the very significant likelihood that such pragmatic additions to provide additional living space have a high likelihood of coming forward. Indeed there are numerous examples of such structures in the vicinity, including the adjacent and neighbouring properties. Even acknowledging these established characteristics, in my view the dormer proposed is significantly more successfully integrated into the architecture of the building with these proposals, with the flanking wing providing visual cover for its profile on the

northern elevation. In these circumstances therefore I do not agree that the dormer would be visually disproportionate or fail to be sufficiently subordinate.

15. I am mindful that criteria 6 of policy BD5 (Extensions to existing dwellings) requires dormers not to occupy more than 40% of the rear roof pitch, amongst other matters. Whilst no precise percentage calculations are offered by the Council, it is clear that the proposed dormer would most likely be in breach of this parameter. However, BD5 also requires that proposals complement the character of the building and incorporate roof profiles and materials sympathetic to it.
16. For the reasons I set out above, I conclude that when taken as a whole the proposals, particularly in relation to the profile of the roof on the front elevation and the first floor wing, achieve these overarching aims of the policy. Moreover, and critically in the context of this case, the aims of the policy and supplementary guidance have to be applied in relation to the established character of the context of the development. Here, given the nature and extent of the alterations to adjacent dwellings, and the tangible measures the design offers to resolve and unify the additions proposed, I conclude there would be no material harm to the character and appearance of the area. So, when the policies of the development plan are taken as a whole, there would be no conflict with policy SP3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document, policies BD1 and BD5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (BWPPD) and the guidance set out in the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, all of which seek to deliver high quality design and the safeguarding of the character and appearance of the area.

Effect on living conditions

17. The key components that may affect the living conditions of adjacent occupiers are the ground floor flat roofed extension and the rear first floor wing. Whilst the ground floor extension would extend along the boundary with No.90 for some 1.7m, this is limited in relation to the current extent of that property and its curtilage as a whole. Moreover, given the fact that No. 90 lies to the south of the appeal property, there would be no sense of overshadowing or perceptions of enhanced enclosure as a result of the development.
18. The proposed development would be no greater in extent than the additions to No 86. Indeed, even if there was an enhanced perception of the appeal property in relation to the first floor wing, the first floor rooms in this property did not appear to be primary habitable rooms and no loss of outlook causing material harm to occupiers would result. For these reasons also find no conflict with policies BD1 and BD5 of the BWPPD identified above.

Conditions

19. The appeal being allowed I attach a condition requiring the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to assure certainty. I also attach a condition requiring that the materials used in the external cladding of the additions match those of the existing dwelling, to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. As indicated above I have also attached a condition requiring the submission of details of treatment to the front elevation of the dwelling also to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

20. For the reasons given above and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Morgan

Inspector