

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2021

**by Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 21 September 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref. APP/W5780/D/21/3275215**  
**62 Uplands Road, Woodford Green IG8 8JN**

- 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 Volodymyr Sokulskyy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application ref. 1368/21, dated 29 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2021.
  - The development proposed is described on the application form as “*Two Storey Rear Extension and Loft Conversion*”.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural matters

2. An application for a full award of costs has been made by Mr Volodymyr Sokulskyy against the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge. This application will be the subject of a separate decision and is the more appropriate place in which to cover the appellant’s reservations about how the Council handled the planning application.
3. In July 2021, after the submission of this appeal, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published, replacing the 2019 edition. I have had regard to this document, but it is evident that the substance of the Framework, as it relates to the sole main issue in this case, has not changed. In such circumstances, I am satisfied that there is no requirement to seek the views of the parties on the revised Framework, and that in taking such an approach no prejudice to any party would arise.

### Main issue

4. The main issue is the impact of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider area.

### Reasons

5. Uplands Road is a long and straight avenue characterised by short terraces of 2-storey houses. The appeal property lies at the end of a terrace of 3 houses. Its main roof has a hipped end. The rear of this terrace can be viewed from some of the neighbouring rear gardens and from various sections of the service
-

roads that provide access to the rear gardens of the dwellings along Uplands Road and Canfield Road. The surrounding area is residential in character.

6. The Council has no objections to the proposed hip to gable roof extension, the removal of a chimney or the installation of 6 roof lights in the front roof slope. Whilst the Council's delegated report appears to be critical of the size and scale of the proposed box dormer to the rear roof slope, for whatever reason this concern did not find its way into the Council's decision notice, which must be treated as the Council's official and settled view on the subject application. The decision notice addresses the roof form over the first floor of the rear extension and the choice of materials for the rear dormer and rear extension below.
7. Whereas the flat-roofed ground floor part of the rear extension would do no more than consolidate the line of similar such extensions to be found at nos 64 and 66 in the host terrace and at nos 58 and 60 in the closest adjacent terraced group, the flat-roofed first floor part of the rear extension would be a notable departure from the prevailing pattern of development hereabouts. The only first floor rear extensions I could identify in views from the appeal site were at nos 68A and 88. The planning history behind those additions is not before me. They are situated some distance away within different terraced blocks on the southern side of the junction between Uplands Road and a service road and are not designed with flat roofs. There are no binding local precedents for the proposed flat-roofed first floor rear extension in the evidence before me.
8. The most relevant policy from the development plan is Policy LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (Local Plan). This will support householder development if, amongst other things, it complements the character of the building particularly in terms of scale, style, form and materials, incorporates a roof profile and materials sympathetic to the existing dwelling and respects the Council's householder design guidance. With regard to 2-storey or first floor rear extensions, the Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted in September 2019, advises that their roofs should match the roof design of the original house and their eaves should not exceed the eaves height of the host property. Whilst the flat roof over the first floor rear extension may limit the volume of the addition, compared to a pitched roof, its built form and profile would visibly clash with the roof design of the original house and the neighbouring houses. The fact that the top of the roof would reach above the existing rear eaves line and join onto the proposed rear dormer would further add to the adverse visual effect of the chosen roof form.
9. The appellant explains how the materials have been chosen as a deliberate contrast to the traditional materials evident on the existing building. The rear walls are currently a rather unappealing mix of painted brickwork and painted render. Given this and the coverage of the extension across the rear walls, the use of dense concrete masonry blocks with a shot-blasted finish in ivory may be an appropriate innovation and I note that the Council does not specifically criticise this material as such. I can only see a direct reference by the Council to the use of zinc. I have no serious concerns about the use of powder-coated zinc in grey-beige as a material for the flashing at the rear of this property, but its wholesale use to clad the top, sides and rear face of the proposed box dormer leaves a lot to be desired when the original roof of the appeal property and the sides and rears of the box dormers at nos 58, 60 and 64 are all clad in

red tiles. This material would not be sympathetic to the finish of the existing dwelling. Moreover, the visual dissonance this would cause would be made worse by the size of the dormer, its layout as a continuation of the wall face below and its prominence at a high level in views from the rear.

10. Careful choices over roof design and materials of construction are important even though the site is not within a conservation area. Contemporary and innovative architectural designs are not discouraged by the Framework or the SPD but they should still fit in with local character including the surrounding built environment. The proposal falls short in this important respect.
11. Viewed as a whole, the development proposal would not relate positively to its context or represent a visually attractive solution that would add to the overall quality of this area. Rather, it would fail to complement or enhance the host residential building and the immediate surroundings and would conflict with the SPD. I find on the main issue that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider area. As the scheme would involve unacceptable alterations at a residential building, there would be conflict with the aims of Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Local Plan and Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021 which all seek to deliver good design.
12. There would also be a failure to adhere to the overarching design themes of the Framework insofar as they relate to achieving well-designed places. The scheme would fulfil the social dimension of sustainable development as set out in the Framework by adding floor space to the accommodation at this fairly small family home and by removing the sense of enclosure at the rear due to the setback at ground floor level and offer a limited economic benefit to the building trade, but the environmental dimension would not be fostered given the harm I have found under the main issue.
13. The Council, correctly in my view, did not identify an excessive loss of amenity for neighbouring properties for any reason. The lack of harm in that regard does not outweigh the harm I have found under the main issue.
14. My finding on the main issue is decisive to the outcome of this appeal. There is conflict with the development plan. The harm cannot be mitigated by the imposition of planning conditions and it is not outweighed by other material considerations. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should not succeed.

*Andrew Dale*

INSPECTOR