
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3258721

3 Lansdowne Villas, Lansdowne Road, South Woodford, London E18 2AT

- 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 Fabrizio Lintesi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1490/20, dated 22 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a ground and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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

Preliminary Matters

3. The appellant's name has been taken from an email received from their agent, confirming the correct spelling of their name.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling, located in a row of four terraced dwellings, on the corner of Lansdowne Road and Tavistock Road. The surrounding area is residential in nature, with varied dwelling types. However, the row of terraces in which the appeal property sits is more modern in appearance than many of the surrounding buildings with an unusual roof profile. The appeal property currently has a plastic awning to the rear which the proposed development would replace with a two storey rear extension to provide additional internal living accommodation.
6. The Council have no objections to the ground floor part of the proposed rear extension and I have no reason to disagree with their finding, therefore this appeal will focus the first-floor element only.

7. The appellant has highlighted that the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2019 requires the angle and form of the roof of the extension to match the existing dwelling. The proposed roof form does attempt to replicate the nature of the existing roof form on the appeal dwelling. It also complies with the 45-degree rule to prevent the proposal impacting upon the neighbouring dwellings, and would not be more than half the width of the house, which are also requirements of the SPD. However, in this case, the combination of flat and pitched roof forms across this small extension would appear overly busy and would result in a peculiar addition to the property which would be harmful to the overall appearance of the dwelling. It would also appear as a dominant and incongruous addition to the row of terrace properties, which are largely uniform in nature at first floor level.
8. Despite being set back from Tavistock Road, the first floor of the rear of the appeal dwelling is still visible from this viewpoint and is not blocked by any of the properties between the appeal site and the road or the row of garages located between the two. The proposed first floor element of the proposal and its roof form would therefore be highly visible within the streetscene and its uncharacteristic form would have an intrusive and detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and contrary to Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018). This policy seeks high quality design which is well integrated and has regard to and respect for the surrounding area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has stated that they received no communications from the Council during the planning process or after the decision was issued contrary to a positive and proactive approach. However, this would not alter my consideration of the planning merits of the scheme.

Conclusions and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. 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