The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2020

by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3244923
1 Heatherwood Close, Wanstead, London E12 5SB

- 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 Miss Louise Hammond against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
- The application Ref 3400/19, dated 27 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2019.
- The development proposed is a front extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a front extension at 1 Heatherwood Close, Wanstead, London E12 5SB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3400/19, dated 27 August 2019, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: 19050-P001, 19050-P002, 19050-P003, 19050-P004, 19050-P005, 19050-P006, 19050-P007, 19050-P008, 19050-P009, 19050-P010, 19050-P011, 19050-P012, 19050-P013 and 19050-P014.

   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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the house, the terrace and street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to an end of terrace house. The terrace comprises 7 houses presenting a rhythm of projecting single garages with a catslide roof over and recesses alongside to the main two storey front wall. The rhythm is disrupted by the handing of some houses so that at nos. 3 and 4 there are adjacent projecting catslide roofs whilst at nos. 5 and 6 there are adjacent recessed walls. There is a similarly designed terrace at 8-13 Heatherwood Close in which the regular rhythm of projecting garages with a catslide roof over is punctuated by adjacent recessed walls in the centre of the terrace.

4. The proposed front extension would disrupt the present rhythm of spaces by infilling the recess alongside the projecting garage, but I note that there is an extant permission here for an extension with a flat roof. The continuation of the sloping catslide roof in the appeal proposal would result in a bulkier appearance but its double width massing would resemble the catslide roof at nos. 3 and 4. It would not detract from the staggered design of the terraces in Heatherwood Close given the present handing of some houses.

5. The flank wall to the house occupies a prominent position in the street scene due to a bend in Heatherwood Close and the presence of single storey garages alongside. The inclusion of an indent to the extension would enable the present prominent gable end profile to be retained and the original front wall would be glimpsed. The present first floor front bedroom window would be covered by the extension; provision of a replacement window in the flank wall and the new side entrance below this would provide points of interest in the flank elevation. The design to front and side walls would respect whilst not strictly matching the approach to the terraces' design and the use of matching materials would ensure a satisfactory appearance.

6. The proposal would incorporate a roof profile and materials sympathetic the existing dwelling. It would thereby be in accordance with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) which encourage innovative and good design that respects the local character of the area and makes a positive architectural contribution to its context and location. There would not be conflict with the Housing Design SPD (2019) which specifies that alterations to the front of a house should be proportionate in scale and sympathetic in character to minimise the visual impact on the host property and the street scene.

Conclusion

7. The proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the house, the terrace and street scene. For the reasons outlined the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions to limit the lifespan of the permission, to list the plan numbers in the interests of certainty and to require the use of matching materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance. The appellant has suggested other planning conditions mainly relating to landscaping and sustainability. In my judgement these are not necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms. As the approved plans would be listed in a condition it would be possible to apply for minor material amendments to the extension should this be expedient.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR