



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2020

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3250006

106 Freshwell Avenue, Chadwell Heath, Romford RM6 5DR

- 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 M Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0015/20, dated 4 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension, double storey side, with extension of dormer over side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached, 2-storey house within an urban residential area. At my site visit I saw a number of extensions have been added to other dwellings within the locality. The overall trend is towards the evolution of building form and appearance through the extension of houses over the years.
 4. I note that the London Borough of Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document September 2019 (SPD) states that two-storey extensions should be subordinate to the host property with a set-back at first-floor, the ridge should be set below that of the main house, such additions should be no more than half the width of the property and should have a matching roof design and pitch.
 5. There are several elements to the appeal scheme. It would be evident from Freshwell Avenue that the ridge height of the two-storey front/side element would continue the ridge line of the existing property and the front elevation would be flush with the host dwelling.
 6. It would also be more than half the width of the property. From the front I am of the view that this in itself need not be harmful given the set-back of the house from the highway and the angle at which the dwelling faces the streetscene. However, cumulatively the extent of the proposals would lack architectural subtlety, with the tapering of the extension to the rear representing an inelegant design.
-

7. Being flush with the front elevation and the ridge line, the addition would lack subservience. The imposing appearance of the extension would be in contrast to the existing dwelling, and compete with its overall scale. It would represent a bulky addition to the detriment of the character of the building.
8. I am aware that the dwelling's original roof was hipped. However, it is clear that the existing house now has a gable end. Taking a pragmatic approach, I consider that the proposed gable end would not be harmful to character within this context.
9. At the rear, the large, unbroken dormer window would dominate the roof of the property. It would be clearly visible from the private amenity spaces of surrounding dwellings, having a jarring effect by virtue of its scale and extent across the roof of the dwelling, and with no separation from the existing rear dormer.
10. The width and rearward projection of the first floor rear element would result in a technical breach of the SPD guidance. However, it would be of an appropriate design and set well away from the boundary with the adjoining dwelling. To my mind, it would visually connect with the overall appearance of the existing house without dominating it, and also respond to its design characteristics. It would be appropriately sited in relation to the property and would be unobtrusive when seen against the form and scale of the existing dwelling.
11. The rearward projection of the single storey rear addition would again result in a technical breach of the SPD guidance. Nevertheless, given its low level nature and overall lack of visibility I consider that it would not cause material harm to the character of the dwelling and the surrounding area.
12. The Council has not raised an objection to the porch and have no reason to disagree. I am aware that the development is acceptable in respect of the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring houses. However, this argument does not outweigh the harm to character and appearance that I have identified above. I also recognise the presence of other extensions in the neighbourhood. Nevertheless, additions to other houses would be neutral considerations in any balance against planning harm, and in any event each case must be assessed on its own merits.
13. Although the first floor and single storey rear extensions are acceptable, the two-storey front/side element and the rear dormer window would be harmful to the the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area. There would be conflict with policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan March 2018 and the SPD, which seek to ensure development complements the character of a building and is of high quality design.

Conclusion

14. Based on my reasoning above, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR