



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2020

by Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26/02/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3253006

10 Empress Avenue, Wanstead, London E12 5ES

- 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 Marty Randall against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4319/19, dated 8 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition and reconstruction of the rear single storey extension at ground floor level, relocation and replacement of two rear existing windows with two no. dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building, surrounding area and Aldersbrook Conservation Area (CA); and ii) the impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Empress Avenue lies within Aldersbrook CA which is characterised by tree-lined streets of two-storey, mainly terraced, Edwardian houses in brick, render, stucco and tile with repeating bay windows, giving an attractive uniform rhythm to the streetscape.
4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling on the south side of the road. The appeal property has a sympathetically designed, rear ground-floor extension, approximately 4m wide and 4.5m deep, in brick with a hipped roof, matching the existing dwelling. Other properties on this side of the road have been extended but not the neighbouring, conjoined dwelling at No. 12. That has an outrigger on the boundary with No. 14.
5. It is proposed to demolish the existing ground-floor extension; erect a new deeper full width extension with sections of both mono-pitch and flat roofing; and add two small dormers to the rear roof slope of the original dwelling.

6. The Council considers the dormers acceptable. I see no reason to disagree.
7. Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) refers to the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD). The SPD has a 'rule of thumb' of a depth of 3.5m for single-storey rear extensions. Greater depths are only considered acceptable where consistent with adjoining properties. The proposed extension, at a depth of circa 5.4m, would result in a protrusion well beyond that of the existing extension, the extension at No. 8 and the outrigger at No. 12.
8. There are examples of flat-roofed, rear extensions on this side of the road. Notwithstanding this, the SPD limits these to a height of 3m. The proposed flat-roofed section of the extension generally satisfies this. However, the mono-pitch section of roofing rises to around 4.5m, exceeding the limit in the SPD. Consequently, the mono-pitched roof encroaches into the first-floor level, and the proposal involves the loss of two upstairs window openings.
9. The original dwellinghouse has a depth of 7.5m to 8.5m. Therefore, the proposed extension, taking its depth, width and overall height together, would not be diminutive, resulting in a form, scale and massing that does not respect the existing context thus causing harm.
10. Therefore, I concluded that the proposal would be both out-of-scale and uncharacteristic, detrimental to the appearance of the appeal property. Thus, the proposal does not comply with policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018), having regard to the content of the SPD. Among other things, these require a high standard of design that complements the existing building, respects local surroundings and maintains or conserves heritage assets.
11. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is of considerable weight and importance. This is reflected in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 193 which states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of the degree of harm. Having regard to the above, I conclude the proposal would not preserve the character or appearance of Aldersbrook CA.
12. NPPF at paragraph 196 requires that less than substantial harm be weighed against any public benefits. It appears that any such benefits attributable to the proposal are of private nature. Therefore, on balance, these do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

13. The proposed extension would create a solid, blank façade, about 5m in length and 3m high, on the boundary with No. 12. The principal downstairs glazed opening at No. 12 comprises French doors with surrounding glass panels, and is close to this boundary. The proposed development would result in this opening being enclosed on both sides. Therefore, I consider that the living conditions of the occupiers would be significantly affected in terms of both outlook and daylighting.

Conclusion

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

Euan FS Pearson

INSPECTOR