
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2017

by S Jones MA DipLP

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

Decision date: 26 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3171737
97 Walpole Road, South Woodford E18 2LN

- 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 Macatonia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4980/16, dated 20 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and rear extension with new roof and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area
 - The living conditions at 95 and 99 Walpole Road, particularly with regard to light and outlook

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The area is characterised largely by rows of terraces, however this road contains a mixture of types and styles of housing, including different styles of roof. The property is a symmetrical fronted detached house on slightly rising ground in a suburban area close to the North Circular Road. The current property is relatively wide but not very deep. The property is sited at a slightly higher level than the adjoining properties. This in combination with its width means that it appears prominent in the streetscene.
 4. No overall increase in roof height is proposed, and I note from drawings 22216/04 and 22216/05 that the new roof would appear to have a pitch with inset hipped gables which would reduce the bulk of the roof, particularly at the front. The central section of the roof would be flat and as there is a mixture of roof styles in the vicinity this could not be said to be out of keeping in this particular location, so I consider this roof style would be acceptable.
-

5. To the righthandside, No 95 is set down from No 97 and is a semi-detached dwelling with a plain flank wall and a garage separating it from No 97. Given the proposed hipped and inset roof design of the proposed side extension and the 1m setback from the shared boundary, the new roof would be only slightly closer to No 95 than at present. As such, the proposed roof would have little or no harmful effect on the visual relationship with No 95 when viewed from the street.
6. Adjoining this property on the left handside at No 99 is a semi-detached dwelling with an unconventional design which is set back from the road to a much greater degree than No 97. This exposes this side of No 97 to views from the street more. Consequently, the scale of the 2 storey rear extension would be more readily apparent. The extension in conjunction with the side elevation of the existing dwelling would create a large expanse of brickwork, relieved only by a small high level window. Furthermore the roof as a whole would cover a significantly larger area over the side and rear additions and incorporate a sizeable box style rear dormer, so overall it would be larger and far more bulky. This would increase its dominance in the streetscene to a significant degree and appear incongruous. I appreciate that a rear dormer might be permitted development, and that there are other types of extensions in the road, however I am considering this one in the context of the overall development.
7. The two storey side extension would unbalance the front symmetry of the existing dwelling and increase the overall bulk. Overall this would further increase its prominence in the streetscene, specifically in relation to No 95 because it is set down, and to neighbouring properties generally because they are of a more modest scale. In combination with the overall increase in footprint, the increase in bulk and visual prominence would result in the proposed development appearing out of scale with the host building and the surrounding area.
8. Consequently for the above reasons as outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, contrary to Policy SP3 of the 2008 Redbridge Core Strategy Development Plan (CS), which seeks to protect the amenity of the locality. It would also conflict with Policy BD1 of the 2008 Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan (BWP) because it would not be compatible with the amenity of the area in which it is located, and its scale, massing and design would not be appropriate to the locality. It would also fail to comply with Policy BD5 of the BWP because it would not complement the host building but instead dominate it, and the rear dormer would occupy a large proportion of the roof. The advice in the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document would be contravened because the proposed development would project out beyond the rear main wall and the rear extension would not be set away at first floor level.

Living Conditions

9. The side and rear extension closest to No 95 would be two storey and roughly 3m deep. This would result in a plain flank wall that would run by No 95, past its garage and its plain flank wall. There are mature trees which already darken the rear of No 95. I consider that the extension would not unacceptably reduce living conditions at No 95 or have a serious effect on light or outlook because of

a combination of the 1m setback around the side extension and the hipped inset roof, together with the intervening garage, and the lack of any side windows in either property here.

10. Turning to consider the effect on No 99 I note that the front ground floor windows at No 99 are already behind its own garage, which is built forward of the front elevation, and to some extent already overshadowed by No 97. The side ground floor windows to the main living areas of No 99 face roughly south and look directly onto the garden of No 97. Although it is suggested that these are secondary windows, they are windows to the main living areas, so they are of primary importance.
11. The current plain flank wall of No 97 ends roughly at the porch to No 99. The proposed development would continue past this by about 3m at very close quarters. Although it would not run past the farthest window in the side elevation of No 99, it would overshadow that window as the sun moved around because of the two storey height, the proximity and the fact that the extension would be located on the south boundary of No 99. I conclude any privacy gained from the interposition of this flank wall would be outweighed by the harm to other living conditions as the extension would overshadow and enclose the ground floor windows on that side at No 99, and restrict light and outlook to them to an unacceptable degree contrary to Policy SP3 of the 2008 CS and Policy BD1 of the 2008 BWP which seek to protect the amenity of adjoining properties.

Other Matters

12. The appeal includes reference to the roof alterations at 99/101 Walpole Road and 41 Snaresbrook Road, and I refer to paragraph 4 above concurring that the proposed roof shape would be acceptable. However, its particular size and bulk would not. Whilst I appreciate that the area also contains a number of dormers and other similar extensions that reflect some of the characteristics of the proposed development, without knowing the particular circumstances in each case, I consider that generally these are less extensive or not identical to the case before me which is dealt with on its own merits.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jones

INSPECTOR