



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3260260

34 Glengall Road, Woodford Green IG8 0DL

- 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 Ashraf U Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1515/20, dated 22 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolish garage. Single storey side and rear extension with patio. Loft conversion with two side and two rear dormers. Five roof lights. Erection of front boundary wall with metal gates. Alterations to fenestrations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of garage; single storey side and rear extension with patio; loft conversion with two side and two rear dormers; five roof lights; erection of front boundary wall with metal gates; alterations to fenestrations at 34 Glengall Road, Woodford Green IG8 0DL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1515/20, dated 22 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan; SE_1564-01/P1; SE_1564-02/P1; SE_1564-03/P1; SE_1564-04/P1; SE_1564-05/P1; SE_1564-06/P1; SE_1564-07/P1; SE_1564-08/P1; and, SE_1564-09/P1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of proposed development shown on the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form is more precise than that shown on the planning application form. I have therefore used this description in the heading above and the decision.
3. The Council's second reason for refusal relates to the effect of the proposed rear extension on the setting and safety of a tall boundary tree at the rear of the site. I saw that the tree has been removed and there is no information

before me to show that it was protected by a tree preservation order. Accordingly, the proposal would cause no harm to existing trees.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a large detached 2 storey dwelling with pleasing architectural features including bay windows, gables, chimneys and decorative timber detailing. The property has a garden to the side and rear, and the rear boundary adjoins the end of Blueberry Close. The area predominantly consists of residential properties that display a variety of architectural styles.
6. Paragraph 3.2.2 of the London Borough of Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (the SPD) sets out that, as a general rule of thumb, single storey rear extensions to detached houses should not exceed a maximum depth of 4.5 metres. Paragraph 3.2.3 states that depths greater than this will only be acceptable where this would be consistent with adjoining properties. The proposed rear extension would be stepped, with depths of around 5 metres and 6 metres respectively, which would exceed the guidance maximum depth in the SPD. Nevertheless, each case must be considered on its individual merits.
7. In this regard, the neighbouring property at No 32 has an existing single storey rear extension which extends close to the rear boundary, and the depth of the proposed extension would be consistent with this. The proposed extension would appear subordinate to the host dwelling due to its single storey height. Furthermore, the stepped layout would respect the proportions of the host dwelling and limit the bulk of the proposed extension. The mono-pitched roof design would integrate satisfactorily, and it would not interfere with any architectural features. Consequently, the size, massing and siting of the proposed extension would not appear dominant in relation to the host dwelling or the surrounding area.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed rear extension would maintain the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It would therefore comply with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (the Local Plan), which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new extensions are of high quality design, complement the character of the building, subordinate, and incorporate a sympathetic roof profile. Whilst there would be some conflict with guidance contained in the SPD, this is outweighed by the lack of harm that the proposed development would cause.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In order to maintain the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the external surfaces of the development to be finished in materials to match those used in the existing building.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR