
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2020

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01/03/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3261159

135 Whitehall Road, Woodford Green, IG8 0RZ

- 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 Babar Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
- The application Ref 2694/20, dated 24 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2020.
- The development proposed is excavation of basement with rear light well, a single-storey front extension, a porch, conversion of garage into habitable room, part single, part 2-storey side and rear extensions, alterations to roof, and alterations to fenestrations.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for excavation of basement with rear light well, a single-storey front extension, a porch, conversion of garage into habitable room, part single, part 2-storey side and rear extensions, alterations to roof, and alterations to fenestrations at 135 Whitehall Road, Woodford Green, IG8 0RZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2694/20, dated 24 August 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06 'Proposed Basement Floor Plan', 06 Rev A 'Proposed First Floor Plan', 07 Rev A, 08 Rev A, 09 Rev A, 10 Rev A, and 12.
 - 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No 135 Whitehall Road has some recent planning history that is relevant to the consideration of this appeal. Planning permission was granted on appeal (Ref APP/W5780/D/19/3239916) in February 2020 for works described as '*single storey front extension/porch, single storey rear extension and basement with rear lightwell*'. The Council subsequently granted planning permission for an alternative form of development in August 2020 for works described as '*Excavation of basement with rear light well. Single storey front extension. Porch. Conversion of garage into habitable room. Part single, part 2 storey side and rear extensions. Alterations to roof. Alterations to fenestration.*' (Ref 2048/20). In the intervening period the Council refused planning permission for works described as '*excavation of basement with rear light well, the erection of part 1, part 2 storey side and rear extensions, alterations to roof, a front porch and alterations to fenestration*'. A subsequent appeal was dismissed for this development in December 2020 (Ref APP/W5780/D/20/3255234).
4. The current appeal proposal is based heavily on the development consented in August 2020. There is no dispute between the parties regarding: the proposed single-storey rear and side extension; the front porch and front extension; the alterations to fenestrations; the garage conversion; the basement; the part first-floor rear extension; the first-floor infill extension; or the raised rear decking that is shown on the plans. Although the appeal proposal includes all these different elements, the only issue between the parties relates to the impact of the additionally proposed first-floor side extension.
5. The property is a two-storey, detached dwelling with two side wings that are subservient to the main bulk of the dwelling. These are recessed behind the front elevation and with lower ridge heights. The proposed first-floor side addition would project around 0.6m from the side elevation of the dwelling and would align vertically with the ground floor of the property to this side. It would be recessed around 5.5m from the principal elevation of the dwelling and would have a depth of around 3.6m, aligning to the rear with the principal rear elevation of the original property. Its height and form would match the existing side wing, appearing subservient in scale and position to the main bulk of the dwelling.
6. The Council correctly assess the proposal as adding a second step to the side elevation of the property at first floor level. They consider that it would be an oddly placed and incongruous addition. I disagree. It would merely add a further level of articulation to a building that is already heavily so by reason of the varied roof profiles and staggered building lines. The side projection would match the form of the existing building and, to my mind, would appear as a well-considered and integrated part of it, being seen as neither bulky nor incongruous.
7. The forwardmost part of the existing side wing would remain appropriately recessed behind the front wall of the house, ensuring it would continue to appear sub-ordinate. Furthermore, despite the proposed new side projection at first floor level, the property would remain to be set away from the side boundary of the plot by around 0.9m. This gap, combined with the deeply recessed position of the new extension, would ensure an appropriate

relationship with the adjoining property at 137 Whitehall Road would be maintained.

8. The Council is further concerned that the symmetry to the existing building would be unacceptably harmed. However, although there is some degree of symmetry to the dwelling, the recessed position of the proposed extension would ensure that the change would not dramatically alter this when seen from most angles of sight from Whitehall Road. In any case, I am not persuaded that the building's symmetry has any particular significance within the established character and pattern of development in the area, which is varied, with little regimentation or uniformity to the dwellings along this side of the road.
9. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal would display the design quality needed to appropriately complement the character and form of No 135, and to respect the established character of the local area. There would therefore be no conflict with Policies LP26: *Promoting High Quality Design* and LP30: *Household Extensions* of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested three conditions. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external materials that are to be used.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, I find that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR