
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2022

by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21ST April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3291509

60 Hollybush Hill, Wanstead, LONDON, E11 1PX

- 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 M.S. Razak against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref. 4085/21, dated 27 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension with Juliette balcony to rear. Alterations to fenestrations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter & Background

2. The description of development above has been taken from the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form. Whilst normally this would be as described on the original application form, the above is a more succinct version of the detailed explanation included on that form.
3. Planning permission was granted for a single storey side/rear extension at the property in 2021, under application ref. 2052/21.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached house in a prominent position in the street scene, being on a corner at the junction with Hollybush Close. As a result of a previous side extension the dwelling occupies much of the plot width, and is sited close to the adjacent footway of Hollybush Close. A two-storey rear section is inset from the boundary, and the planning permission granted in 2021 would 'square off' that part of the building footprint.
6. Large detached dwellings characterise the area, but the spaciousness at the appeal property derives from the front and rear gardens due to the proximity of the building to the boundary with Hollybush Close. The house on the opposite corner of the junction is set further back from the Hollybush Close frontage,

with the closest elements being single-storey. It therefore makes a different contribution to the sense of space in the street scene than offered by the appeal site. In this context, I do not share the Council's view that the proposal would disrupt any sense of symmetry in the street scene.

7. Nevertheless, the length of two-storey wall close to the southern side boundary that would result from the proposal would appear unduly dominant in the street scene, thereby undermining its character. The Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD) advises that on corner plots, bulky extensions may be refused where they would fail to be subordinate to the host property and present a large blank flank wall to the side street. Whilst the overall elevation would not be blank, the resulting wall facing the road would appear unduly bulky and overbearing due to its length. Cumulatively, side and rear extensions to the host dwelling would not appear subordinate.
8. In addition, the dwelling already has a complex roof form, and this proposal would introduce an awkward and highly visible link that would appear incongruous on the building, rather than complementary as suggested by the appellant. I appreciate the purpose of the crown roof is to reduce bulk and to maintain subservience through its stepped effect, but in so doing it would conflict with Policy LP 30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (LP), which requires extensions to incorporate a sympathetic roof profile; to complement the character of the building in terms including scale, style and form, and to maintain or improve the appearance of the locality or street scene.
9. The single-storey infill extension on which the proposal would be built would introduce its own changes to the street scene, but it would be markedly different in terms of its scale and visual impact on the dwelling and its setting. As such, despite its equally close proximity to the southern boundary, it does not justify acceptance of the appeal proposal. Although the proposed floorspace may be modest in area and accommodation, it would be quite significant in its overall impact on the dwelling and the street scene.
10. The appellant advises that the existing boundary wall and hedge would serve to prevent the house from being too visually dominant. However, even if it proves possible to retain the hedge with the limited gap available, the wall and hedge would not mitigate the additional height of the proposed first-floor extension.
11. I therefore conclude that as a result of the scale, bulk, design and siting of the proposed first-floor extension it would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene. It would conflict with LP Policy 30 and the SPD, and with the overarching design aims of Policy LP 26, which amongst other criteria seeks development which respects the local character of the area, and makes a positive architectural and urban design contribution to its context and location.
12. For the above reasons, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR