

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2022

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3282338

49 Clayhall Avenue, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0PW

- 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 Mandeep Rattan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1680/21, dated 19 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension and loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with accommodation in the roof located within a residential road of mixed property types. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character.
4. Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) promotes high quality design. Policy LP30 of the Local Plan requires the same of household extensions, including that they should incorporate a roof profile that is sympathetic to the existing dwelling and that the extension maintains or improves the appearance of the locality or street scene.
5. The Council's *Housing Design* Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides guidance on residential extensions. With regard to first floor rear extensions it says that these should generally be kept to a maximum of three metres. The SPD also indicates that dormer windows or roof extensions must remain subordinate within the roof slope. Rear dormers should be symmetrically located and be at least 0.5 of a metre below the ridge of the roof, one metre above the eaves and set in one metre from shared boundary and from the edge of the roof.

6. The existing rear elevation of the property has a slight inset at first floor level from the ground floor and a pitched roof. The roof slope includes a number of rooflights to enable existing use of the roof space for accommodation. As such, it has the conventional character and appearance of a two storey dwelling with accommodation in the roof. Moreover, its pitched roof form reflects the predominant roof type within the surrounding area.
7. The first floor extension would result in the forward projection of the upper storey by a limited degree so that it would match the depth of the ground floor. This would not result in a significant degree of change, would not alter the existing fenestration and would reflect a typical rear elevation of a two storey dwelling. I acknowledge the Council's concern that the additional extension proposed would result in an overall depth of more than three metres beyond the original rear elevation, which is the maximum referred to in the SPD. However, the SPD is guidance and provides some flexibility as it refers to a general approach. In this case, the proposal would have the limited effects described and so would not result in material harm.
8. The change to the roof would be more substantive as this would extend the pitched roof forward so that it would be level with the floors below. This would add considerable bulk and mass to the roof, giving it a top heavy appearance and effectively creating a third storey to the property. This change in appearance would be exacerbated by the different fenestration, with the addition of windows more in keeping with those on the floors below. Moreover, as the extension would cover the whole of the roof slope on what is a large, wide dwelling, it would not be subordinate but rather an overly dominant feature of the rear elevation. Consequently, for these reasons, the roof extension would materially and harmfully alter the character and appearance of the appeal property.
9. These changes would be visible from surrounding dwellings and their gardens, and particularly from Peel Place to the rear. From these views the extended roof would contrast unfavourably with the predominant pitched roof form of surrounding dwellings and would, therefore, appear incongruous and uncharacteristic in the residential setting.
10. I acknowledge that a similar roof to that proposed exists on the neighbouring dwelling, No 47. However, this dwelling is not as wide as the appeal property and, therefore, the changes are not as extensive or prominent as those proposed here. Moreover, due to the uncharacteristic appearance compared to the pitched roofs of surrounding properties, this existing extension does not create a positive precedent for the current proposal.
11. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed loft extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it is contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) and to the SPD, as described above.

Other Matters

12. I have had regard to other matters raised by an interested party. There is no basis to suggest that the proposal would harmfully affect the natural light available to the neighbouring property, No 51, particularly due to the relative

orientation of the two dwellings. However, I accept that the additional bulk and forward position of the roof would be an overbearing presence seen from No 51's rear garden, which adds to the findings of harm with regard to the main issue.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR