



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2020

by K Savage BA MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3256449

55 Hollybush Hill, Wanstead, London E11 1PX

- 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 Mrs Z Akhtar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1689/20, dated 11 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, two storey part single storey rear extension, change of roof profile, loft conversion with two rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension, two storey and part single storey rear extension, change of roof profile and loft conversion with two rear dormers, at 55 Hollybush Hill, Wanstead, London E11 1PX, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 1689/20, dated 11 June 2020, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: ZAAVIA/55HH/601/A; ZAAVIA/55HH/602/A; ZAAVIA/55HH/603/A ZAAVIA/55HH/604/A; ZAAVIA/55HH/605/A; ZAAVIA/55HH/606/A; ZAAVIA/55HH/607/A; ZAAVIA/55HH/608/A; ZAAVIA/55HH/609/A; ZAAVIA/55HH/610/A.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No 55 is a detached dwelling standing on the corner of Hollybush Hill and the small residential cul-de-sac of Forest Close. The surroundings comprise large, detached dwellings of generally similar scale but varied design and materials.
4. The proposed rear extension would be shallow in depth at 1.96 metres, replacing, at the same depth, an existing balcony at first floor level and infilling the void beneath it. The extension would form a wraparound structure with the proposed side extension at ground floor level, but the extensions would remain

separate at first floor level. A two storey rear extension of similar scale was granted permission on appeal in 2019 (Ref: APP/W5780/W/19/3222835)

5. The Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (September 2019) (SPD) states that a first floor rear extension should generally be no more than half the width of the original rear elevation to ensure it is proportionate and subordinate to the host property. Policy LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (March 2018) (the RLP) requires extensions which complement the character of, and are subordinate to, the existing building. However, as my colleague Inspector pointed out in the aforementioned appeal, Policy LP30 does not place a specific restriction on the width of an extension.
6. The first floor of the rear extension would be more than half the width of the existing dwelling. In a similar vein to my colleague Inspector, I find that the width of the extension would be offset by its shallow depth, and the added width of the side extension, such that it would not appear excessive in scale or dominate the rear elevation, but would assimilate into the massing of the dwelling without significantly changing its overall scale or shape. The proposal would also retain the ground and first floor bay windows as in the allowed scheme. The overall scale and form of the rear extension would not appear discordant given the varied rear elevations to neighbouring properties.
7. The proposed double hipped roofs to the rear extension would be somewhat unique, but relatively minor elements that would integrate into the main roof and would complement the prevailing hipped roof form of the building and the surrounding area, as would the proposed change of the main roof to a crown hip, and the modest rear dormer windows. Overall, the roof forms would preserve the form and appearance of the building and area generally.
8. The side extension would achieve a subordinate appearance given its narrow width, its setback from the front elevation and the lower height of its hipped roof. It would also be set in from the side boundary in line with the SPD guidance and would not appear overbearing when viewed from Forest Close. The wraparound element of the extensions would be limited to the ground level, partially screened by the side boundary wall, and would not have a harmful effect on the overall shape or scale of the building.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposals would preserve the character and appearance of the area, and so would comply with the aims of Policies LP26 and LP30 of the RLP to require development of high design quality which respects the local character of the area; and with the guidance of the SPD.
10. The proposal was not refused by the Council on the basis of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, and having viewed the positions of the nearest dwellings on site, I am satisfied no demonstrable harm would occur.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary, to provide certainty. A condition requiring the use of materials to match the existing dwelling is also necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

K. Savage INSPECTOR