The Planning Inspectorate

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/19/3233202
72 Kings Avenue, Woodford Green IG8 0JF

- 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 and Mrs Daniel and Joanna Barber against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
- The application Ref 1255/19, dated 26 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2019.
- The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension and two-storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension and two-storey side extension at 72 Kings Avenue, Woodford Green IG8 0JF, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 1255/19, dated 26 March 2019, subject to the conditions set out at the end of this decision.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 72) makes up part of a pair of semi-detached houses, both of which have previously been altered by way of hip-to-gable and rear dormer roof extensions. No 72 is served by a front-facing gable with catslide roof feature and projecting bay windows, features that are similarly repeated to the adjoining property (No 70).

4. The surrounding area is predominantly typified by semi-detached housing. Whilst appearing similar in terms of their size and scale, properties in the area vary in terms of their detailed design and fenestration. Indeed, a variety of hipped and gabled roof forms are in existence. Several properties in the vicinity of the site have already been extended to their sides in a variety of different styles and forms. There is thus a mixed residential character and appearance in place in the area.

5. The two-storey side extension under consideration here has been designed to appear subservient to the main dwelling. Its full height would be set slightly beneath the full ridge height of the main dwelling and a part-hipped design is proposed. The extension would be set behind the front-facing gable feature

(with catslide roof) that already serves the property, such that it would not appear unduly prominent in the streetscene nor unduly unbalance the appearance of a pair of semi-detached premises (Nos 70 and 72). The pitch of the proposed roof hip, when viewed from Kings Avenue, would closely match that exhibited by the exiting catslide feature.

6. The proposed two-storey side extension would be viewable adjacent to No 74 to the north, which is also an extended semi-detached dwelling. No 74's side extension is of hipped roof design and is thus complimentary in form when compared to the main roof to which it is attached. The proposed extension before me would be respectful of No 74, being, in-part, of similarly hipped design. In any event, a visible gap would be maintained between Nos 72 and 74, allowing No 74 to continue to be read as part of a wholly independent pair of semi-detached properties.

7. The appellant considers that an intended dark metal finish to the roof of the two-storey extension would create a contemporary contrast with the existing roof. They have also referred to an existing metal trim around the exterior of the main house that such a material would match with. I am not however aware of any other metal roof finishes in the vicinity of the site, indeed none were apparent during inspection. The proposed metal roof, whilst not extensive in coverage, would be clearly visible from public vantage points when considering its height and positioning on the site. Notwithstanding the appellant's reference to an existing metal trim, a metal finish would lead to the proposed roof appearing as a discordant feature in an area generally typified by tiled external roof materials.

8. In this instance, whilst the proposed plans are labelled to indicate the provision of a metal roof, a planning condition could be imposed to secure that it is instead finished in tiles to match existing. This is an approach that the appellant has accepted and that would not, I consider, modify the proposed development in such a way that would make it substantially different from that set out on the plans before me. I am thus satisfied that no party with an interest in this appeal would be prejudiced by me taking this approach.

9. The single storey element of the proposed works, which would be interconnected with the two-storey side extension discussed above, would be discreetly sited to the rear of the appeal site and would represent a subservient and appropriate addition to No 72. Indeed, the Council has raised no objections to this element of the proposal if considered in isolation.

10. For the above reasons, the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. The proposal accords with Policies LP26 and LP30 of Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted March 2018) in so far as these polices require that householder development is subordinate to the existing building, in terms of size, scale or height, incorporates a roof profile and materials sympathetic to the existing dwelling and maintains or improves the appearance of the locality or street scene. The proposal accords with the development plan and material considerations do not lead me to a decision otherwise.

Conditions

11. In the interests of certainty, a condition specifying the approved plans is required. To protect the character and appearance of the appeal site and its

surroundings, a condition is required to ensure that the external surfaces of the development match existing building materials. For the same reason, noting that several proposed plans are annotated to indicate the provision of a metal roof, this condition shall make it clear that planning permission is granted based on the two-storey side extension's roof being tiled to match existing.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

Andrew Smith

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 00_001; 00_002; 00_101; 00_102; 00_110; 00_120 (Existing Side Elevation); 00_120 (Existing Front and Rear Elevations); 00_201; 00_202; 00_210; 00_220; 00_221.
3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building. Notwithstanding any annotation upon the approved plans indicating otherwise, the roof of the two-storey extension hereby permitted shall be tiled in a material that matches the surface of the existing roof.