



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3242652

116 Bressey Grove, South Woodford, London E18 2HX

- 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 H. Bhatia against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 3140/19, dated 26 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2019.
 - The development is a proposed gable roof to side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a gable roof to side extension at 116 Bressey Grove, South Woodford, London E18 2HX, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 3140/19, dated 26 June 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. SSC 9385/ PL02, SSC 9385/ PL03, SSCD 9385/PH2/01, SSCD 9385/PH2/02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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 proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 118 Bressey Grove, with regard to light.
4. The impact of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.118 was not included in the reasons for refusal as stated in the decision notice. However, I have included living conditions in the main issues as it is clear from the officer report that this was an area of concern.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached property on the northern side of Bressey Grove within an established residential area. The appeal dwelling has a pitched roof with a rear dormer and a two-storey flat roof element which abuts the neighbouring property at 118 Bressey Grove. The surrounding area is characterised mostly by semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs. However, on my site visit, I observed a number of properties on Bressey Grove had been altered to feature pitched gable-ended roof designs. Nos. 110 & 112, to the east of the appeal property, have incorporated pitched gable-ended roof profiles with No.110 also featuring a two-storey pitched roof extension which abuts the hipped roof at No.108.
6. The Council states that the proposed extension would disrupt the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses the appeal dwelling forms part of. Although there is concern this would have an adverse impact on the streetscene, I find it would tie in with the existing dwelling and surrounding vernacular which is mixed in character. Indeed, the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses has already been altered owing to the pitched roof of the appeal property. The proposed pitched roof design would therefore complement the existing roof and would not unacceptably jar with the hipped end of the roof at No.114. Furthermore, the slight set-back from the front elevation and lower ridge height would ensure the development would appear to be subordinate to the original dwelling and would not constitute a discordant addition.
7. In my view, in light of the immediate context on Bressey Grove and the visible variation between pitched gable-ended roofs and hipped roofs, the proposed development would not be incongruous and would thus not have an adverse impact on the street scene.
8. I therefore find the proposal would be compatible with the existing dwelling and would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development would comply 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.

Living Conditions

9. Given the relationships between the properties I viewed on site, and the orientation of the buildings, I am satisfied that there would be no significant loss of sunlight or light as a result of the proposed development. It would thus not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.118, with particular regard to light.
10. Given the above, the development would not conflict 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. This is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which aims to ensure a high standard of amenity for residents.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested a number of conditions that it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was successful. I have considered the

suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.

12. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials match the existing building, to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

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 allowed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR