



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2021

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3270658

7 Laura Close, Wanstead, London E11 2DG

- 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 and Mrs David and Fozia Dick against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4320/20, dated 18 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey front extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer at 7 Laura Close, Wanstead, London E11 2DG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 4320/20, dated 18 December 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: A000, A00, A01, A02, A03, A04, A05, A06, A08, A09, A10 and A11.
 - 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 host property and the area.

Reasons

3. Policy LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) ('RLP') supports householder development subject to various criteria, including that it complements the character of the existing building and is subordinate to it, that it has a sympathetic roof profile, maintains spacing between structures and maintains the appearance of the locality.

4. The host is the last property in a short row of three detached dwellings which are angled away from Laura Close ('Nos 3, 5 and 7'). Whilst their front faces are broadly aligned, No 7 is wider at two storey level compared to No 5, is finished in different brickwork, has different detailing and is slightly lower in height. The dwelling at 9 Laura Close ('No 9') is much closer to the road, such that the whole of its flank wall is forward of No 7.
5. Many nearby properties have gabled roofs. However, there are also examples of hipped roofs, such as the two storey extension at 11 Laura Close which projects in front of its neighbour, and at the end of Lorne Gardens. From the site I also observed some high-level flat roofs, including opposite it in Ranelagh Gardens, as well as on some nearby dormers.
6. Consequently, whilst the dwellings in the locality are generally two storey and set back from the road, there is little consistency in terms of the style, form, siting or pattern of development.
7. As a result of the proposal, No 7's front face would be brought closer to the road. However, it would still be set well back from it, and significantly behind the front face of No 9. The spacing between the flanks of those two buildings would not be markedly different from others in Laura Close. Whilst the scheme's front face would be stepped forward of No 5, its flank would retain a similar distance to the side boundary, and this relationship would not appear out of place given the already staggered layout of properties in Laura Close.
8. Unlike some nearby properties, No 7's front elevation would not contain a front porch or other single storey projection, but it would be articulated to provide some definition, and such features are not a defining characteristic of the area.
9. Given the scale of No 7's proposed front extension, and the proposed slight increase in its roof height, the scheme could not be described as a subordinate addition, and the host property's front face would be considerably altered. However, the proposed roof height would broadly align with No 5, and its short section of crown roof high up on the building would not stand out in this diverse area.
10. Turning to the proposed rear alterations, the dormer would span most of the roof. However, it would be set in slightly from the roof's edges and, in the context of other nearby dormers on Laura Close and to the rear of the properties on Buckingham Road, it would not appear incongruous. There is a tall fence on the plot's rear boundary with trees in the garden beyond, which would assist in screening the rear alterations from the Wanstead Grove Conservation Area. For all those reasons, the proposed rear alterations would be acceptable and the scheme would preserve the setting of that designated heritage asset.
11. Summing up on this issue, whilst the host property's appearance would alter as a result of this scheme and it would have a greater bulk, in the context of this diverse area, that would not harm the streetscene, and the resultant dwelling would not appear out of place.
12. As the proposed front extension would not appear subordinate to the existing building, it would fail to satisfy one of the criteria in Policy LP30. However, for the above reasons the scheme would not harm the character and appearance

of the host property or the area, and it would not conflict with RLP Policy LP26's stance of promoting high quality design which respects local character.

Other matters

13. As the nearest part of No 5 to the proposed front extension contains a garage at ground floor, and given the scheme's slight cut in at first floor level, the outlook from the front of that property, including from its first floor habitable room window, would not be significantly harmed.
14. The outlook from the proposed rear dormer with Juliette balcony would be predominantly over the host's short rear garden towards the longer rear gardens of the properties on Buckingham Road. However, those views would be partially screened by existing trees. Some of the properties on Buckingham Road have rear dormers and the extent of overlooking here would not be uncommon in residential areas such as this.
15. As the nearest Buckingham Road dwellings lie to the west of the site, and having regard to the sun's trajectory and existing landscaping, they would not experience significant overshadowing as a result of this scheme. For all those reasons, including the distance between No 7 and the rear faces of the properties in Buckingham Road, those occupants' living conditions would not be impacted to a harmful degree.
16. Turning to No 9, given the staggered relationship of the properties, the side wall of the scheme would be clearly seen from its rear openings and from its adjacent garden. However, whilst the scheme would bring the built form closer to No 9, it would be off set to one side, and as no windows are proposed in its side face, the scheme would not impact on the occupants' privacy. Additionally, as No 9 lies broadly to the south of the site, the scheme would not have a harmful impact on the availability of natural light.
17. Finally, given that planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, any effect on property values is not a material consideration.

Conditions and Conclusion

18. Proposals must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, I have found that whilst the scheme would not fully comply with RLP Policy LP30, it would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area, and on this issue, it would accord with the broad thrust of the development plan when considered as a whole.
19. I am also satisfied that the scheme would not harmfully affect the living conditions of adjacent occupiers. Consequently, and irrespective of the appellants' personal circumstances, the appeal will be allowed.
20. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Additionally, in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the area, a condition is necessary requiring that the development be faced with matching materials.

21. Whilst this would be a large house extension, in broader terms the scale of the development would be modest and construction impacts would be temporary. Consequently, whilst I have considered concerns raised regarding impacts on health and ventilation during construction, the submission and approval of a construction management plan is unnecessary.
22. For the above reasons, having regard to all other matters raised, including all representations by interested parties, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR