
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: 26TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3290787
50 The Drive, South Woodford, LONDON, E18 2BJ

- 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 Dr Ravi Gupta against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref. 3794/21, dated 3 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is ground floor and first floor rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to first floor rear extension. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted insofar as it relates to ground floor rear extension at 50 The Drive, South Woodford, LONDON, E18 2BJ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 3794/21, dated 3 September 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted: A revision C; 826-200-L-001 Revision B; 826-000-L-002; 826-000-L-003; 826-200-L-X01 Revision C; 826-200-L-X02 Revision C; 826-200-L-X03 Revision C; 826-200-L-X04 Revision C; 826-200-L-R01 Revision C; and 826-200-L-003.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the Snaresbrook Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located within Snaresbrook Conservation Area, and this part is characterised by individually designed Victorian/Edwardian and interwar residences set back behind the long green of The Drive. Although the dwellings in the area retain their original character,

many have been extended and altered, including the appeal property. I share the assessment of Essex County Council as a heritage consultant, that the building makes a positive contribution to the conservation area, particularly through its roofscape.

4. The proposed first-floor rear extension would have a flat roof and would project from a hipped roof element. Despite its reasonably shallow depth, it would be a prominent feature on the building as a result of its position, width and its unsympathetic roof form, at odds with the existing mix of pitched roofs. It would create an awkward relationship with the roof slopes of the existing ground floor element above which it would sit. Whilst it may be subservient to the host building in terms of its proportion, it would nevertheless appear as an incongruous feature relative to its architectural form, and would not respect a building which makes its own positive contribution to the street scene. This would be in conflict with Policy LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (LP), which requires household extensions to complement the character of the building in matters including style and form, and to incorporate a roof profile sympathetic to the existing dwelling.
5. I note that a flat roofed side dormer window was allowed at appeal in February 2022, under ref. APP/W5780/D/21/3281215. However, that feature was more modest in scale, more discreetly sited, and was conventionally set within a roof slope. As a result, it would have a materially different relationship to the main dwelling than the proposed extension.
6. Although the existing dwelling would screen the proposal from The Drive, it would be clearly visible in views across gardens from Broadwalk to the south. The roof of the garage would limit some views, but at the points where it would be seen I do not share the appellant's assessment that the visual impact would be marginal or negligible.
7. There is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area in exercising planning functions. For the reasons outlined above, the first-floor rear extension would not preserve the setting. Having regard to paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area as a designated heritage asset, but I do not consider this harm to be negligible as suggested by the appellant. It is not evident that public benefits of the proposal would outweigh this harm, as required by paragraph 202.
8. There are other nearby examples of flat-roofed extensions to dwellings, but none appear to be directly comparable to this proposal in terms of design and relationship to their respective host dwellings. Moreover, no details of any planning permissions granted for those developments have been supplied, and therefore I cannot gauge similarities with the proposal in terms of the planning policies against which they were assessed. As first-floor flat roofed extensions are not prevalent in the vicinity, these additions offer only limited support to the proposal.
9. The parties advise that the proposed ground floor rear extension already benefits from a planning permission granted under ref. 4171/20 on 7 April 2021. Only partial information of that permission has been provided, although the proposed roof form of the ground floor extension appears to differ from the approved roof shown on drawing No.826-200-L-101 included in the appendix to

the appeal statement. However, given that the principle of a glazed extension linking the garage and dwelling has already been accepted, I find this proposal to be acceptable in its impact on the dwelling and the conservation area. As this element is clearly severable from the proposed first-floor extension, and both physically and functionally independent, I propose to issue a split decision.

10. I therefore conclude that, as a result of its design, form and siting, the proposed first-floor rear extension would detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling, and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Snaresbrook Conservation Area. This would conflict with the Framework, as reflected in LP Policy LP33 and Policy HC1 of The London Plan 2021 (TLP), and with the design aims of LP Policies LP26 and LP30, and TLP Policy D3, which amongst other criteria seek high quality design which respects the local character of the area and makes a positive architectural and urban design contribution to its context and location.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit, I have attached a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. It is also appropriate to control materials to match the existing dwelling, in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the development and the area.

Other Matters

12. As part of this appeal, the appellant suggested that an amendment to replace the proposed flat roof with a three-pitched hipped roof. However, there is no scope to introduce revised plans as part of a Householder appeal. Third parties should have the opportunity to consider such a material change, and as such this alteration would be too significant to be addressed through a planning condition.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed in part and allowed in part.

H Lock

INSPECTOR