



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 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: 12 March 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3240903**

**14 Broadmead Road, Woodford Green IG8 0AY**

- 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 Kay St. Louis against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
  - The application Ref 3496/19, dated 4 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2019.
  - The development proposed is a double storey rear and side extension.
- 

### 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.

### Main Issues

3. 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 No.16 Broadmead Road, having particular regard to outlook.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

#### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located on the southern side of Broadmead Road. A single storey garage abuts the flank of the appeal dwelling. The house is white rendered and features a rear roof dormer. It lies within an established residential area characterised by pairs of semi-detached properties with side garages. Broadmead Road itself contains a mix of architectural styles, however on my site visit I noticed that many properties displayed common features such as two-storey front bays, white render and single storey side garages. Several properties also have side and rear extensions.
-

5. The proposal would result in the demolition of the garage and the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension. The extension would therefore appear as a double storey 'wrap-around' extension abutting the boundary with the neighbouring property at No.16. Notwithstanding the reduced roof height of the extension compared to the main house and first-floor set-back behind the main front elevation of the existing dwelling; it would appear disproportionately large due to its two-storey height, excessive depth and overall scale. It would unbalance the scale and form of the house and so fail to reflect the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Although the proposed roof form and external materials, including white render, would tie-in with the host dwelling, the scale and bulk of the proposal when seen with the existing large rear roof dormer would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the property and would thus constitute poor design.
6. The resulting dwelling would appear awkward and would constitute an architecturally discordant feature in the area. I acknowledge there are several properties in the area that benefit from side and rear extensions, however, these are more modestly sized in that they are either only single storey, recessed away from their boundaries at first floor level, or do not project further back than the main house. In this case the extension would project substantially past the existing rear elevation on the house and so, due to this excessive depth, the development would be uncharacteristic of the area. As such it would harm the appearance and character of the immediate area. Although the proposal would not be prominent in the street scene, the protruding two-storey rear extension would still be visible to a number of properties in the area.
7. 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, compliment the character of the host building and the appearance of the locality. I have also had regard to the 'Householder Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which seeks the same.

#### *Living conditions*

8. The combined depth and height of the proposed development combined with its position along the boundary with No.16, would result in the extension appearing obtrusive and over dominating when seen from the neighbouring property. Although I am satisfied there would be no significant loss of daylight or sunlight for the occupants of No.16 as a result of the development, the erection of a tall, long and blank wall along the common boundary would have an overbearing impact on the visual outlook of the occupants of No.16.
9. Notwithstanding the fact that the neighbour's windows closest to the appeal property are obscure glazed and serve non-habitable rooms, and that there would be no breach of the 45° line from the nearest window on the main rear elevation, the development would still have a dominant effect and lie in a prominent position close to the rear private outdoor amenity space of No.16. The scale of the development would thus be unsympathetic and adversely impact the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of No.16.

10. The development therefore conflicts 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. It would also fail to adhere to the similar guidance set out in the SPD.

### **Other Matters**

11. I note the appellant's reference to the pre-application guidance received from Council officers, as outlined in the appeal statement, however this has had no bearing on my assessment of the proposal put before me.
12. I acknowledge the appellant's personal family needs with regards to the refurbishment of the property. Although I sympathise with these personal considerations, I consider that the permanent harm to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupants through the erection of the proposed extension, outweighs the private benefits to the appellant.

### **Recommendation**

13. 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**

14. 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