



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 April 2022

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3292800

2 Stanford Close, Woodford Green, London, IG8 8DY

- 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 Ardian Bracaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4339/21, dated 21 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'FAST TRACK APPLICATION for proposed first floor front extension above porch'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The Council's decision describes the proposal as a 'First floor front extension. Alterations to fenestration'. It is clear from the plans that this describes the proposal more accurately and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. The development plan includes policies LP26 and LP30 in the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (LP) which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that developments are of a high quality design and of a scale that enhances the character of the dwelling and respects the surrounding area.
4. The appeal site occupies a prominent location at the corner of Stanford Close and Hazeleigh Gardens in a residential area of mainly semi-detached, two storey dwellings. The dwelling forms one half of a pair of semis which were built, like the others in Stanford Close, in a broadly uniform style with a simple rectangular plan form, of brick with pitched roofs and flush front elevations relieved only by a small canopy over the front door. Most dwellings have white upvc windows and some have had porch extensions. The adjoining dwelling has not had significant extensions and broadly retains its original character and appearance.
5. The appeal property has a lawful development certificate for a front porch, loft conversion with rear dormer and three front rooflights. It also has planning permission for a single and part first floor rear extension and a single and part

first floor side extension. The Council has said that the approved extensions were not constructed. At my visit, however, I saw that significant building works were underway that have resulted in a wide, double fronted main elevation with a central porch. I have not made any assessment regarding whether or not those works are in accordance with the approved plans. However, I noted that the original character of the dwelling has been much altered and the works have had an unbalancing effect on the pair, exacerbated by the use of light-coloured render for the walls and aluminium windows.

6. The proposed development would extend at first floor level over the porch that is currently under construction. Although the proposed gabled roof would sit well below the main ridge and would be of a modest depth and width, the siting of such a high projection in the centre of the main elevation would result in an unduly dominant feature. Its impact would be heightened by the large, aluminium 'apex' window and the proposed external render which, whilst matching the materials of the dwelling, would contrast unacceptably with the materials of the most of the surrounding dwellings.
7. I noted at my visit that there are several properties in the vicinity of the appeal site, on Hazeleigh Gardens and Purleigh Avenue, that have two storey front gabled projections but those were clearly part of the original, symmetrical design for the pair or the terrace. That is not the case here and the proposal would further unbalance the character of this pair of semis.
8. The appellant has referred to rendered properties to the rear of the site on Purleigh Avenue but those form a terrace rather than one half of a pair of semis as in this case. There is a rendered semi at no 28 Hazeleigh Gardens where the adjoining dwelling is brick but this stands out somewhat uncomfortably in the street scene. Those examples do not, therefore, set a precedent for this proposal.
9. The proposed development would be very clearly seen in the approach up Hazeleigh Gardens. For the reasons given above, I conclude that, by reason of its siting, size, design and materials, it would cause significant harm to the character of the area and would be contrary to the development plan policies referred to above. There are no material considerations that would outweigh that and the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector