



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3238333

7 Knighton Close, Woodford Green IG8 0NU

- 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 & Mrs Paul and Annette Morris against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 2403/19, dated 30 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the garage. Single storey side and part three storey rear extension. Alterations to roof height. Loft conversion with two front and two rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The description of development used in the header above is based on that used on the appeal form and the Council's decision notice and it is not disputed by the appellant.
4. Two revised plans (drawing nos. 2047-01 A and 2047-02 J) were submitted with the appeal. They show the existing and proposed plans in relation to the neighbour's property at 8 Knighton Close. The plans do not materially change the development therefore I accept the plans and consider no parties would be prejudiced by my doing so.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of 8 Knighton Close, having particular regard to outlook.
-

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey detached dwelling with front and rear pitched roof gables and detached single garage abutting the boundary with 8 Knighton Close. It lies within the Monkham's Residential Precinct (MRP). Although the site is not within the Woodford Broadway Conservation Area, the MRP is defined in the Woodford Broadway Conservation Area Appraisal as being characterised by its architectural unity and the contrasting greenery provided by gardens and surviving elements of Epping Forest. Knighton Close itself is a quiet cul-de-sac characterised for the most part by bungalows. The neighbouring property to the west, at No.6, has been extensively extended to the rear, whilst No.8 to the east has a flat roof single storey garage and large shed to the side sited on the eastern boundary of the appeal site.
7. The proposal would result in the demolition of the garage, the erection of a single storey part side and rear extension, and the erection of a three-storey extension and first floor dormers. Notwithstanding the depth of the extensions at No.6, and the fact that the appeal site is large, the three-storey height, excessive depth and overall scale of the rear extension would appear disproportionate considering the modest size of the existing property. It would unbalance the scale and form of the house and so fail to reflect the character and appearance of the host dwelling. I also find that the shallow pitch of the proposed central three-storey gabled extension would contrast with the existing roof pitch, and although the design attempts to mimic the existing gabled element, it would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the property and would thus constitute poor design.
8. Similarly, the proposed first floor dormers that extend over the proposed ground floor element at the rear would constitute bulky additions owing to their considerable depth. They would substantially and negatively alter the appearance of the existing dwelling.
9. When considering all the elements of the proposal together, the resulting dwelling would appear awkward and would constitute an architecturally discordant feature in the area. As it occupies a prominent position, being centrally located on Knighton Close, and because it is adjacent to a number of low-lying bungalows, the proposal would be partially visible in the street scene. It would also be visible from a number of nearby properties. As such it would harm the appearance and character of the immediate area.
10. I note the references to other developments on Monkham's Lane. However, the proposed rear extensions differ noticeably from the rear extensions in the area, including that at 65 Monkham's Lane which is only 2-storey. The appellant also refers to No.22 Monkham's Lane, which was recently redeveloped. In my view, although No.22 is sited within the MRP, the immediate character of the area surrounding No.22 and along Monkham's Lane differs from the urban grain on Knighton Close. Indeed, that section of Monkham's Lane comprises large two-storey properties as opposed to the low-lying bungalows on Knighton Close. The immediate context being different, I consider that those references do not affect my view that the proposed development would harm the appearance of the appeal property and the predominant character of Knighton Close.

11. I therefore find the proposal would not be compatible with the existing dwelling and would result in a visually discordant feature that would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development would conflict with policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (the 'Local Plan') which together seek to ensure proposals are well designed and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area in which they lie, as well as policy LP33 which seeks to ensure proposals respect the intrinsic character of Residential Precincts.

Living conditions

12. The neighbouring property at No.8 has dormer windows facing the appeal property. By virtue of the separation distance between No.8 and the appeal property and because the windows are obscure glazed, I do not find that the proposed development would impact the outlook from the windows to such an extent that it would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupants of 8 Knighton Close.
13. The development therefore accords with policies LP26 and LP30 of the Local Plan which aim to ensure new development and residential extensions respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

Other matters

14. The appellant refers to the permitted development process which allows for 8m single storey rear extensions to detached houses. This has little bearing on the case before me as the proposal includes first floor dormers and a three-storey extension. I therefore do not attribute material weight to this point.

Recommendation

15. Although I find the extensions would not adversely impact the living conditions of the occupants of 8 Knighton Close with regards to outlook, an absence of harm in this regard does not lend positive weight to the proposal and so could not outweigh the negative impact on the character and appearance of the area.
16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR