

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2021

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3281946

22 Wensley Avenue, Woodford Green, IG8 9HE

- 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 Prashant Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application, Ref. 2196/21, dated 24 May 2021 was refused by notice dated 15 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension; conversion of garage into a habitable room.
-

as explained above Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is one half of a semi-detached pair with No.24 which for the most part are in their original matching form that makes a noticeably positive contribution to the street scene.
 4. The Council has no objection to the rear extension and the conversion of the garage to a habitable room. I agree with these findings as these particular alterations and additions would neither adversely affect the living conditions of the neighbours nor harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the overall appearance of the pair of dwellings.
 5. As regards the two storey side / rear extension, the addition also has some design merits in that it would be set well down from the ridge (by 2.2m) to achieve some subordination and sufficiently set back from the front elevation (0.5m) to be correctly read as an addition to the original dwelling. Both of these features would comply with the Council's Housing Design Guide SPD and matching external materials with an eaves line consistent with the host dwelling are also welcome.
 6. However, those features notwithstanding, I consider that the proposed width of 4.4m would be noticeably too wide in comparison to the modest width of the existing semi-detached dwelling. The crown roof would be a bulky and alien
-

feature, in itself of poor design and wholly out of character and scale with the host property.

7. The size and 'up and over' design of the double garage door would also jar with the much more traditional appearance of the existing dwelling. And whilst in itself this might be difficult to justify a refusal, it nonetheless adds to the overly utilitarian appearance of the extension which would be read as an unsympathetic enlargement of No. 22. As such, the eye would be drawn to the significant and harmful imbalance with No. 24 as the other dwelling in the pair.
8. The grounds of appeal argue that the scheme has been reduced in size from the pre-app submission; that a 2m side garden would remain; that most of the houses in the road have had side extensions, and that there are a number of similar approved schemes in close proximity in Wensley Avenue and other roads.
9. However, whilst I have taken account of these points I am unable to give them significant weight, because I have assessed the proposal on its individual merits. I do not take the view that other unsatisfactory development in the form of over-scaled or unsympathetic extensions should justify a development that in this particular case would materially harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of semis with No. 24 and this part of the street scene.
10. For these reasons the proposal would be in harmful conflict with Policies LP26: 'Promoting High Quality Design' & LP30: 'Household Extensions' of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 adopted in 2018; the Council's Housing Design SPD 2019, and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.
11. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR