
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2017

by Helen Hockenhull BA(Hons) B.PI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3174403

46 Princes Avenue, Woodford Green, IG8 0LN

- 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 Reeves Anglin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 5801/16, dated 13 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a part single storey and part double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single storey and part double storey side extension at 46 Princes Avenue, Woodford Green, IG8 0LN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 5801/16, dated 13 December 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: Drawing No. 16:158 Site Location Plan, Drawing No. 16:159 – Site Plan, Drawing No. 16:150- Existing Plans and Drawing No. 16:151 – Proposed Plans.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms a traditionally constructed semi-detached dwelling with mock tudor detailing to the first floor front elevation and a front porch with a first floor bow window projecting above. It is located in Princes Avenue, a residential street of both two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings with a variety of house design. The property has an existing detached single storey garage which would be removed to enable the construction of a part single storey/ part double storey side extension.

4. The Council in the reason for refusal argues that the proposed extension, because of its lack of set back from the front main wall of the dwelling, would form an intrusive addition unbalancing the symmetry of the semi-detached pair. The Council requires a 1 metre set back to ensure that the extension looks subordinate to the main house, in line with paragraph B2.7 of the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2012.
5. There is dispute between the parties with regard to the position of the main wall. This is as a result of the design of the existing property. It appears to me that looking at the semi-detached properties as a pair; the main front wall is formed by that part of the front elevation forming the walls surrounding the first floor bedrooms. The ground floor front wall, which contains the front door, is recessed back from the first floor wall so that the porch feature can be created. In the appeal scheme, the two storey side extension would be sited one metre back of the front main wall. It would therefore be in compliance with the Council's SPD.
6. I note that the appeal proposal would have a lower ridge height to the main dwelling and so would appear subordinate and that the materials to be used would reflect those of the existing house. In design terms the proposal would respect the character of the host dwelling.
7. On my site visit I noted the similar side extension to the adjoining semi-detached house at No. 44 Princes Avenue. The presence of this extension already unbalances the semi-detached pair. The proposed extension would give the pair of dwellings a more balanced appearance.
8. The appellant has brought my attention to a number of other similar two storey side extensions in Princes Avenue. These I observed on my site visit. I acknowledge that some of these extensions were likely to have been constructed before the introduction of the Council's Householder Design Guide SPD which requires the 1 metre set back. In any event, I consider that the proposed part single storey /part double storey side extension would not, in this context, appear out of place or adversely affect the character or appearance of the locality.
9. The appeal proposal would therefore comply with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan, Policy SP3 of the Redbridge Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 and Policies BD1 and BD5 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 and the Householder Design Guide SPD. These policies aim to ensure that development is compatible with and contributes to the distinctive character of an area and is of a high quality of design.

Conclusion

10. I have found that the appeal proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the locality.
11. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council in line with the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). In addition to the standard timeframe condition, I consider that a condition requiring the development to be constructed in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt. A condition regarding external

materials is also necessary to ensure there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area.

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised I allow this appeal.

Helen Hockenhull

INSPECTOR