



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 December 2020

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3255234

135 Whitehall Road, WOODFORD GREEN, IG8 0RZ

- 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 Babar Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1302/20, dated 1 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is excavation of basement with rear light well, the erection of part 1, part 2 storey side and rear extensions, alterations to roof, a front porch and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Planning permission has been granted on appeal¹ for development on the site and the following elements of the proposal have already been considered acceptable; the proposed basement, light well and front porch. The previous appeal considered the impact of the side and rear single storey rear extensions on the character and appearance of the area and found these to be acceptable. Therefore, whilst the proposal before me includes a number of different elements, the main issue between the parties concerns the impact of the part first floor rear extension, the first-floor infill extensions and the proposed roof alterations.
4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling within a good sized plot. The property is located along a main road which is characterised by detached dwellings which vary in their appearance and design, with heights ranging from two storey to single storey bungalows.
5. The area is of mixed character and includes both modern and older more traditional properties, however there is no clear pattern of development along Whitehall Road. In particular the differing size and scale of properties create a varied street scene. The existing dwelling is prominent within the street scene

¹ APP/W5780/D/16/3239916

- as a result of its position between two single storey dwellings, but includes elements of subservience as a result of the design of the two side wings which have a lower ridge height than the main roof.
6. The London Borough of Redbridge Housing Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that first floor side extensions should be set back at least 0.5m from the main front elevation of the house and the proposed first floor infill extensions would be contrary to this guidance. The purposes of the requirement are to ensure that extensions are subordinate to the scale of the original house.
 7. The raising of the ridge height associated with the alterations to the existing roof would increase the height difference that already exists between the properties either side. This in combination with the first floor infill extensions would add to the overall bulk of the dwelling and replace the subservient roof form that currently exists and has been maintained within the previously approved scheme.
 8. It has been put to me that the roof would be no less dominant than the roofs of the other detached houses within the vicinity of the site. However, having regard to the scale of the properties adjacent to the site I do not agree with this assessment.
 9. The proposed first floor rear extension would have a greater depth than that suggested within the SPD which states that the depth should generally be kept to a maximum of 3m and will also need to have regard to the 45 Degree rule. I consider that given the layout of the site and the spacing provided between the detached dwellings and the resultant lack of any impact on the neighbouring properties, by virtue of loss of light, outlook or amenity that the modest increase beyond that suggested as a general rule within the SPD would not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the area.
 10. In conclusion, I consider that the increased roof height, in combination with the first floor infill extensions, would appear prominent and over dominant within the street scene, out of keeping with the original dwelling and the character of the area, contrary to policy LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, March 2018 (LP) which, amongst other things, seeks to support householder development which is subordinate to the existing dwelling in terms of size, scale and height and complements the character of the building and requires development to respect local character. The development would also fail to accord with the SPD.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Pannell

INSPECTOR

