



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: 29 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3256476

19 St Clair Close, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0PA

- 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 Yousaf against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0958/20, dated 25 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part double storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council identified a discrepancy in the plans relating to the position of the front elevation of the proposed side extension. The appellant confirmed that the extension is intended to stand flush with the existing front wall. The Council considered the proposal on this basis. I regard this as a minor discrepancy which would not prejudice any interested party were I to take it into account, and so I have considered the proposal on the same basis as the Council.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling stands at the end of a short residential cul-de-sac of modest semi-detached dwellings, which are largely consistent in form with hipped roofs predominating, although the appeal property has a gable end to the side, having added a rear dormer window. The end property on the opposite side, No 20, has extended to the side, as have Nos 1 and 2 at the other end of the cul-de-sac. To the side of the site are the grounds of Caterham High School which are screened by a tall hedgerow.
5. The Council criticises the lack of a setback to the front elevation of the extension; however, the extension to No 20 on the opposite side is flush with the front elevation. Given this, I find no harm would arise from the extension being flush with the front elevation, as it would create consistency between the two dwellings at the head of the cul-de-sac. The inclusion of the hipped roof would not match No 20 but this difference would only be noticeable in direct views from in front of the dwellings and the hipped form would reflect the general roof form in the street.

6. Turning to the rear, the Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (September 2019) (SPD) sets a limit of 3.5m on single storey rear extensions on semi-detached houses. First floor rear extensions are required to be less than half the width of the existing rear elevation and no more than 3m in depth to ensure they are 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.
7. On site, I saw neighbouring properties to have generally modest rear extensions, mainly limited to ground floor level, though some detached single storey outbuildings/garages also exist within the rear gardens. I saw no first floor rear extensions of comparable size or depth to that proposed.
8. The proposals would exceed the SPD dimensions and would add considerable massing to an already significantly extended dwelling. The existing single storey extension projects deep into the rear garden, which has been foreshortened by the construction of a substantial garden building at the rear of the site. The large rear dormer window has also added a visible third storey to the building at the rear, adding to its perceived scale relative to its neighbours. The addition of the proposed side and rear extension would exacerbate this existing disparity in scale, creating a building far larger in size than its neighbours, both in terms of site coverage and visible massing. The first floor element in particular would form a conspicuous addition beyond the general building line at this level. The cumulative massing of extensions to the dwelling, and the large garden building, would be seen together from several neighbouring rear gardens along the terrace and would form a highly dominant and incongruous development which, rather than being subordinate, would overwhelm the original dwelling and would fail to respect the modest scale, and generally consistent layout, form, massing and design of surrounding dwellings.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the RLP which require development of high design quality which respects the local character of the area; and with the aforementioned guidance of the SPD.

Other Matter

10. The proposal was not refused by the Council on the basis of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants. The proposal would not result in additional massing or windows on or adjacent to the boundary with No 17, and I am satisfied no demonstrable harm would occur to occupants of this property. However, an absence of harm in this respect would not overcome the harm identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K. Savage

INSPECTOR