
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2021

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3263943

74 Kings Avenue, Woodford Green, IG8 0JG

- 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 Eric Mouzourides (EM Studio), against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 3289/20, dated 7 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is 1. Ground floor single storey rear extension to replace existing conservatory. New extension to be built in line with existing rear extension. 2. Loft conversion to enlarge an existing box dormer by way of a hip to gable conversion to enable the integration of a dressing area and bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 1. Ground floor single storey rear extension to replace existing conservatory. New extension to be built in line with existing rear extension. 2. Loft conversion to enlarge an existing box dormer by way of a hip to gable conversion to enable the integration of a dressing area and bathroom at 74 Kings Avenue, Woodford Green, IG8 0JG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3289/20, dated 7 October 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: Drawing Nos. SSK-100, SSK-101, SSK-102, SSK-103 and SSK-104.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surface of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the host dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The site is located in a residential street comprising two-storey semi-detached houses of similar scale and appearance, set behind small front gardens/parking areas and with long rear gardens. Most, if not all, of the adjacent dwellings

have been altered and extended over time by loft conversions, hip to gable extensions, large box dormers to the rear, side extensions and rear extensions. External materials and colours also differ along the street.

4. The proposed ground floor rear extension would be marginally larger than the existing conservatory that it would replace. It would infill a gap between an existing extension to be retained and the site boundary. It would match the height and depth of the existing rear extension. The council raised no objection to this element of the proposals and I have no reason to disagree.
5. The proposed roof extensions would match those of many other surrounding properties. Although in this case the roof alteration would be above an existing two-storey side extension, sufficient space would be retained between 72 and 74 Kings Avenue to avoid a terracing effect. The appellant's statement suggests that a mansard roof extension has recently been approved at No 72 Kings Avenue. However, as neither party has provided me with any details of this it has had no bearing on my decision.
6. As a result of a previous two-storey side extension, parapet wall and rear dormer, the symmetry between the appeal property and the adjoining semi-detached house has already been lost, despite the hipped roof design having previously been retained. Given the existing lack of symmetry between the pair of semi-detached houses and the variation of roof forms in the area, the proposed roof alterations would not appear incongruous.
7. Whilst I have had regard to the council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) this is guidance not policy and must be balanced against other factors, such as the presence of similar extensions that form part of the character and appearance of the area.
8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposals would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. The proposals therefore accord with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted March 2018), which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development is of high quality design that complements the character of the building and maintains the appearance of the street scene.

Conditions

9. I have imposed the statutory time limit condition and a condition listing the approved plans in the interests of certainty. I have also imposed a condition to ensure the external materials of the extensions match those of the existing dwelling in the interests of good design and protecting the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR