



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2020

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3253426

36 Greenstead Avenue, Woodford Green IG8 7ES

- 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 Nadeem Butt of Adam Property Development Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0685/20, dated 15 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is "double rear extension to create better room sizes within HMO".
-

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 existing building and the surrounding area.

Preliminary Matters

3. I note that there is a difference between the description in the application form and that used by the Council in its decision notice. I have considered the appeal on the basis of the description shown in the Council's decision notice, a two-storey rear extension.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwellinghouse, in multiple occupation, with a two-storey extension to the side and rear. The appeal property sits in a prominent location on the corner with Langford Road.
5. It is proposed to add a further two-storey extension at the rear of the appeal property. This will result in conjoined extensions, visible from the public realm, running most of the breadth of the original dwellinghouse beyond its original length, thus enlarging the footprint of the host property by over 70%.
6. Therefore, taken together, the extensions are not diminutive, altering the scale, design, character and appearance of the appeal property. I consider that these overwhelm the appeal property causing harm.

7. The proposed extension will carry a hipped roof, matching the existing extension. However, taken together, this represents an incongruous roof form having regard to the paired dwellinghouse (No 38), and neighbouring properties, generally.
8. The rear of the host property is visible from the public realm. I consider, also, that the scale, design and roof form of the extensions, cumulatively, will have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the locality. The presence of such large extensions is not widespread.
9. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with London Plan (2016) policies 7.4, and 7.6; and policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018). Among other things, these require a high standard of design that respects local context and maintains or improves the appearance of the locality or street scene. Similarly, creating high quality buildings and places is fundamental to sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has stated that the proposed extension will increase the living space in two units/rooms. I have taken this into account. The appeal property is occupied and licensed, and this does not change my conclusions on the specific harm I have identified arising from the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Euan FS Pearson

INSPECTOR