



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: 21 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3238402

50 Woodland Way, Woodford Green, IG8 0QQ

- 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 Nick Gillett against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 2665/19, dated 25 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension. First floor side and rear extension. Alterations to fenestrations. Three side roof lights.
-

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.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of 48 Woodland Way, having particular regard to outlook; and
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Monkams Residential Precinct.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living conditions

5. The proposal would result in the demolition of an existing pitched roof garage and a conservatory, the erection of a single storey rear extension, and the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension, adjacent to No 48.
-

6. The neighbouring property at No.48 has numerous windows facing the appeal property. Although some are secondary windows or obscurely glazed, I understand those at ground floor serve habitable rooms. Despite the side extension being set one metre off the boundary at first floor level, its depth, two-storey height and proximity to the boundary means it would appear obtrusive when seen from the neighbour's ground floor windows, leading to a sense of enclosure. The difference in land levels between the two properties would do little to mitigate this. The extension would negatively impact the outlook from No.48 to the extent that it would adversely affect the living conditions of its occupants.
7. The development therefore would conflict with policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (the 'Local Plan') which aim to ensure new development does not adversely impact upon the occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

Character and appearance

8. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey detached dwelling located on the east side of Woodland Way. It features a prominent front gable in the south-eastern corner of the property, as well as two front dormer windows and two sets of distinctive chimneys.
9. The appeal property lies within the Monkham's Residential Precinct. This is not a designated heritage asset so does not benefit from the same protections as a conservation area under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Nonetheless it is described 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. Woodland Way is a winding road with large, detached, dwellings bordering a vast woodland enclave behind. However, in contrast to the description in the Broadway Conservation Area Appraisal, the dwellings are architecturally varied.
10. The design of the side extension would feature a hipped roof extension at first floor level that would be set back slightly from the adjacent dormer, whilst the ground floor element would reflect the position of the existing garage. It would be of a height that would be lower than that of the central part of the dwelling and comparable to the gable at the other end of the front elevation. The windows would reflect the fenestration design on the existing façade. Overall its design would not be inharmonious with the host dwelling or the street scene.
11. The extension would result in an already substantial dwelling appearing larger. Nonetheless, the vicinity is characterised by large dwellings and so the scale of the dwelling would not appear incongruous in its context.
12. I therefore find the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the Monkham's Residential Precinct and so would comply with Local Plan policy LP33 which seeks to ensure proposals respect the intrinsic character of Residential Precincts. The proposed development would also not conflict with policies LP26 and LP30 of the Local Plan and the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 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.

Other matters

13. I note the appellant's reference to the pre-application guidance received from Council officers, as outlined in the appeal statement and attached email correspondence (Appendix 1). However this has had no bearing on my assessment of the proposal put before me.
14. The other examples of extensions to houses in Woodland Way have served to demonstrate the varied architecture in the area and provide justification for the design of the development. However they do not justify the harmful impact on adjoining occupants which would result from the proposal.

Recommendation

15. Although I consider the extension would not harm the character and appearance of the area, this lack of harm is outweighed by the harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 48. Therefore, 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

16. 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