



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3233925

26 Rowland Crescent, Chigwell IG7 6HU

- 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 Petre Petrov against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1920/19, dated 2 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The spelling of the first name of the applicant was different on the Application Form and Appeal Form. However, the applicant subsequently provided clarification of the correct spelling, which I have used. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of 15 and 17 Manford Way; and the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. The position of the appeal property within the site means that there is currently space alongside the property. This provides separation and relief from the existing property when viewed from the gardens of neighbouring properties in Manford Way, which are lower than the site given the topography of the surrounding area. However, the proposed extension would fill this space and continue beyond the rear of the appeal property and the existing conservatory. The proposed extension would therefore be of a length and height that would create a substantial area of solid wall close to the boundary of 15 and 17 Manford Way. This would be particularly apparent in relation to those properties given that the ground level of the proposed extension would be built higher than that of the adjacent houses. The resultant development would be oppressive, overbearing and create an enclosing effect when viewed from the rear gardens of those properties.

5. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 15 and 17. Hence, the proposals would not accord with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted March 2018) (LP). Together these policies seek development that does not adversely impact upon neighbouring occupiers in relation to outlook and has regard to and respect for the surrounding area in terms of, amongst other things, layout, massing and scale. The proposals would also not accord with Paragraph 127 of the Framework which requires that development creates places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Character and appearance

6. The residential area surrounding the site is formed of semi-detached and detached dwellings of a varied appearance. Several of the properties in the street have been extended to the front or side, including the appeal property. The appeal property incorporates a frontage that extends to meet that opposite serving 30 Rowland Crescent. The turning area in the street therefore terminates halfway across the site. Nevertheless, the front and rear of the building are visible from surrounding streets, as well as the gardens of neighbouring properties in Manford Way.
7. The proposed extension would be flush with the existing façade of the property at ground floor but set back at first floor. The ridge would be set down a modest amount from the ridge of the property. The appellant has referred to an extension in situ at No 30, which also incorporates a front extension at ground floor next to its side extension. The proposed extension to the appeal property would present to the street in a similar manner. Whilst the staggered appearance of the side elevation would be visible from the gardens of neighbouring properties, it would be unlikely to be visible from the street due to the private nature of the site frontage. Nonetheless, the proposals would be an inverted version of a similar feature found to the western side of the appeal property and that of No 24.
8. Whilst the hipped roof on the rear portion of the extension would contrast with the gables found elsewhere on the property the pitch of the roof would match that of the existing house and the roofline would be subordinate to that of the existing house. Consequently, the presence of a hipped roof would not be unduly harmful. This would relate to the property in a manner similar to the extension in situ at the rear of 15 Manford Way, which is visible from the street and the site.
9. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing property or the surrounding area. Hence, the proposals would accord with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the LP. Together these policies promote high quality design in the Borough by requiring that development is well integrated and has regard to and respect for the surrounding area, including layout, form, massing and scale. In particular, householder development should be subordinate to the existing building. The proposal would also accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (March 2016), which seek to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to other developments nearby, including at 18 and 23 Fairview Road. Whilst I am not aware of the full circumstances of each situation, the examples provided appear to refer to the design of development in the locality. As I have not found against the appeal scheme in this respect, I have not referred to these developments in further detail. Nonetheless, in any event, I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits.

Conclusion

11. Whilst I have concluded that the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the building or the surrounding area, the lack of harm in that respect does not outweigh the harm I have identified in relation to the living conditions of residents of adjacent properties. For those reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR