



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2022

by M Ollerenshaw BSc(Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/21/3278829

161 and 163 Monkams Lane, Woodford Green IG8 0NP

- 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 Yordan Madzhirov against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1773/21, dated 24 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Following the refusal of the planning application, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. However, it does not materially alter the national policy approach in respect of the issues raised in this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host properties and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey, semi-detached pair of dwellings which are located on Monkams Lane within a residential area. The dwellings are set back from the road with gardens and driveways to the front with larger, private rear gardens, which are bounded by mature hedges and trees. Both properties have two storey side extensions and single storey rear extensions. The two properties are not symmetrical due to the differing designs and sizes of the two storey side extensions. The single storey rear extensions have flat roofs, apart from a small pitched roof at the centre where they are joined together.
5. Within the wider area there is a mixture of styles of detached and semi-detached houses which generally have hipped roofs and tend to be set within large plots with planting in the gardens. Together with the woodland on the other side of the road from the site, this results in a spacious and verdant character.
6. The proposed development would comprise first floor extensions to the rear of both properties which would be joined together and constructed in line with the footprint of the existing single storey extensions below. The extensions would have flat roofs with mock pitched roofs at the rear.

7. The Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD) advises that a first floor rear extension should generally be no more than half the width of the original rear elevation to ensure it is proportionate and subordinate to the host property and minimise the impact on the amenity of neighbours.
8. Contrary to that guidance, the proposed extensions would extend across the full width of the rear of both properties and would be excessively large and out of proportion to the host properties. The lack of any set back from the existing extensions below or from the side elevations of the main buildings would emphasise the scale and massing of the proposals. Although the existing rear extensions have flat roofs, by comparison to the proposal they are of relatively modest proportions and do not dominate the rear of the properties.
9. The flat roof design of the proposed first floor extensions would sit uncomfortably against the roof designs of the original properties and the immediate neighbours, all of which are characterised by hipped roofs. Moreover, the positioning of the eaves of the extensions above the eaves of the original properties is an awkward design detail, which would further detract from the appearance of the buildings and fail to respect the general character of residential built form in the area.
10. Apart from glimpsed views from Monkham Lane in gaps in the trees to the west, the proposed extensions would not be highly visible in the street scene. However, the development would still be highly noticeable and discordant when viewed from the rear gardens of the properties and from neighbouring properties.
11. The appellant refers to other first floor rear extensions in the locality, however no specific details have been provided. I cannot therefore draw any direct comparison between these and the appeal proposal and so cannot be sure they represent a direct parallel to the proposal. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host properties and the surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018), Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and the SPD, which seek, amongst other things, to promote high quality design and ensure that development respects local character.

Other Matters

13. Although the proposal would provide enlarged accommodation within the two properties, this would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the properties and the area. Therefore, this consideration does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR