



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by Andrew Smith BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3231765

12 Hillington Gardens, Woodford Green IG8 8QT

- 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 Mrs Seldan Huseyin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0687/19, dated 17 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Alterations to front elevation (part retrospective). Erection of canopy with supporting pillars'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. It is apparent that the proposed works have already commenced. Indeed, apart from the canopy and supporting pillars proposed to be erected, it appeared from external inspection that the intended alterations to the front of the property have been fully implemented. For the avoidance of doubt and notwithstanding that development has commenced, my responsibility is to consider the appeal based on the scheme as it appears on the plans submitted.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and upon the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located upon a road that is primarily typified by similarly sized and designed two-storey semi-detached properties. Indeed, most properties are served by hipped roofs and centrally positioned chimney stacks, whilst front-facing elevations are characterised by the presence of upper and lower level curved bay windows set beneath a single front projecting gable. A consistent and readily identifiable pattern of development is thus in evidence along Hillington Gardens.
5. In the case of the appeal building, past planning permissions¹ have been granted for a two-storey hipped roof side/rear extension. Indeed, a two-storey extension of hipped roof design is now in place to the side of the dwelling. Contrary to the details of the permissions previously granted, the extension is

¹ 2903/13 and 3945/14

served by a front-projecting gable set above an upper level curved bay window.

6. The extension's gabled roof (as built) closely replicates the design of the property's original front-projecting gable, being only slightly smaller in scale and width. It follows the building's eaves and juts forward from the established main front building line. Indeed, the curved bay window below similarly projects forward of the property's main front elevation. It is thus apparent that the side extension, as built, even though it has been constructed in matching materials and has a lower overall ridge height when compared to the main roof, does not appear as a subservient addition. The extension instead, due to its scale and composition, competes visually with the main dwelling and its original front-projecting gable.
7. In the case of the proposal before me, it is intended that a canopy and supporting pillars be added at ground floor level in front of the property's garage and immediately beneath the curved bay window that has been constructed. This design, as explained by the appellant, is intended to anchor the extension to the ground and to guard against the curved bay window appearing as a suspended feature. Nevertheless, such additions would not reduce the visual prominence or forward protrusion of the extension as constructed. Indeed, the extension would continue to be read as an unduly prominent and discordant addition that significantly unbalances the appearance of a pair of semi-detached houses.
8. The works would not protrude as far forward from the main front elevation when compared to the property's original front-projecting gable and properties to the southwestern side of the property follow a slightly staggered front building line that progresses forward of the appeal property. Even so, whilst available views of the proposed development would be fairly limited in range due to these particular site circumstances, it remains the case that the extension, as set out on the proposed plans before me, would represent a noticeable addition to the streetscene that would readily influence the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its immediate surroundings.
9. A front-facing dormer window of suspended style has previously been permitted, but not implemented at the site. However, this would have represented a discreet and small-scale addition when compared to the sizeable curved bay that is currently in place. Furthermore, a previously approved sculpted parapet wall to the property's garage would have offered a modest and low-level addition to the front elevation.
10. Numerous sizeable side extensions have been constructed along Hillington Gardens and several of these follow the original ridge lines of the properties they serve. It is also the case that many of the original pairs of semi-detached houses are no longer symmetrical in form and that, in some cases, adjacent pairs adjoin to form short terraces. However, this has not led to a disjointed townscape. A recognisable rhythm of built development is still in place that is based, to a significant extent, upon pairs of similarly designed properties served by pronounced and centrally positioned front projecting gables with curved bays below. The scheme before me, which includes the provision of an additional front-projecting gable and curved bay, is at odds with this identifiable pattern and rhythm of development.

11. The appellant has provided photographic evidence of other bay window extensions and pillared development in the area. However, none of the examples given are located in the immediate vicinity or have a visual connection with the appeal site. They do not influence the prevailing pattern of development I have identified along Hillington Gardens and are thus of limited relevance to the scheme before me and to my considerations.
12. The site is not located within a designated conservation area, but it remains the case that new development, if unsympathetic to its surroundings, holds the potential to have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of an area. I have taken full account of the representations of support for the proposal but have assessed the proposal in the wider public interest.
13. For the above reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and upon the streetscene. The proposal conflicts with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted March 2018) and the guidance contained in the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2012) in so far as these policies and guidance require that development respects the local character of the area and, in the case of householder development, complements the character of the building and is subordinate to the existing building in terms of size, scale or height.
14. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not lead me to a decision otherwise.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Smith

INSPECTOR