



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3269538
7 Knighton Close, Woodford Green, IG8 0NU

- 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 Paul Morris against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3330/20 dated 6 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolish garage. Single storey side and two storey rear extension, raising of roof and two front dormer windows to enable loft conversion and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a retrospective application for demolish garage. Single storey side and two storey rear extension, raising of roof and two front dormer windows to enable loft conversion and front porch at 7 Knighton Close, Woodford Green, IG8 0NU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 3330/20 dated 6 October 2020 and in accordance with the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision;
 - 2) 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;
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1AR-100; 1AR-101; 1AR-102; 1AR-103; 1AR-201; and 1AR-301.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposed development is taken from the application form. In its decision notice, the Council describes the development as "Demolish garage. Single storey side extension. Two storey rear extension with balcony. Loft conversion with two front dormers. Alterations to fenestrations (Summary)."
-

3. A previous application¹ for development, which included a part three storey rear extension was refused and dismissed at appeal.² The appellant states that the proposal the subject of this appeal seeks to address the concerns raised by the Council and the Inspector in respect of the previously refused and dismissed application.
4. The Council is content that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of neighbours; and finds the proposed front dormers, single-storey side and ground floor rear extension and raised ridgeline to be acceptable. Consequently, the focus of this appeal is the impact of the proposed first and second floor rear extension.

Main Issue

5. The main issues in this case are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling including a long outbuilding situated immediately adjacent to the boundary with Number 8 Knighton Close. The dwelling is located within the Monkham's Residential Precinct, a residential area characterised by dwellings which range in a variety of styles and sizes.
7. The appeal property is set within a central position, such that it faces directly out from Knighton Close, a residential cul-de-sac, towards its access onto Monkham's Lane. Dwellings along Knighton Close include one and two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. Houses are set back from the street behind short gardens and/or parking areas and have long gardens to the rear. Whilst properties vary in size, style and form and present a variety of roof types, the common set back from the street and presence of red brick, white render and tiled roofs provides for an attractive sense of place.
8. During my site visit, I observed that many dwellings along Knighton Close have been altered and/or extended. Visible changes include extensions to the sides, to the roofs and notably, to the rear of properties, with dwellings extending well to the rear.
9. Whilst it is proposed to extend the appeal property to the rear for some distance, the proposed first and second floor rear extension would sit below a raised ridge line and would be contained within a steeply-sloping tiled roof, with matching materials. I find that this would result in an elegant addition that would appear subservient to and in keeping with, the host property. The proposal would be neither excessively wide nor deep and would appear in keeping with other dwellings in the area, which also extend some considerable distance to the rear. Furthermore, the raised ridge would ensure that the rear extension would not result in any undue sense of appearing disproportionate to the host dwelling.
10. Whilst it is noted that the overall scale of the proposed first and second floor rear extension would exceed the guidance contained within the Council's

¹ Ref: 2403/19.

² Ref: W5780/D/19/3238333.

Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document, this is simply guidance and each development proposal should be considered on its own merits. In this instance, I find that, for the reasons given above, the proposed development would appear in keeping with its surroundings and would not result in any significant harm.

11. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; or to Local Plan³ policies LP26, LP30 and LP33, which together amongst other things, protect local character.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests set out in Paragraph 55 of the Framework. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition controlling external surfaces is necessary in the interests of local character.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal succeeds.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

³ Redbridge Local Plan (2018).