



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 April 2022

**by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 6<sup>TH</sup> May 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3286206**

**41 Woodlands Avenue, London E11 3RA**

- 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 Mrs Michelle Winter against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref 2223/21, dated 12 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2021.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
  - (i) Whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Aldersbrook and Lake House Conservation Area; and
  - (ii) The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 39 Woodlands Avenue, with particular regard to outlook.

### Reasons

#### *Character and Appearance*

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house which is situated within the Aldersbrook and Lake House Conservation Area (CA). Woodlands Avenue comprises handsome semi-detached houses that individually and cumulatively create a high-quality residential environment that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the CA.
4. The appeal property has a narrow single-storey wing to the rear. The proposal would involve the replacement of this modest element with an almost full-width addition with a dual pitched roof. This would extend a significant distance beyond the main rear building line of the appeal property and its attached neighbour. The footprint of this addition would be only slightly less than that of the main part of the house.
5. I note that a substantial rear extension has recently been added to 43 Woodlands Avenue. Details of the planning permission for this extension are not before me, so it is not clear why this scale of addition was deemed

acceptable. The attached neighbouring house, 39 Woodlands Avenue, and other houses in the area have more modest rear additions similar in depth to the existing rear wing of the appeal property, although predominately wider. In this context, due to its significant footprint and rear projection beyond the main rear building line, the appeal proposal would be an overly dominant addition that would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the host building and the CA.

6. This harm to the CA would be less than substantial. In these circumstances Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) requires that the harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. There are no identified public benefits associated with the appeal proposal that would outweigh the unacceptable harm identified above.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It is therefore contrary to Policies LP26, LP30, and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) which require development to be well-designed and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas. There is also conflict with the aims of the Aldersbrook Conservation Area and Lake House Estate Design Guide (2020) which states that the design of new extensions or outbuildings should be in sympathy with, and in proportion to, the main house.

#### *Living Conditions*

8. The proposal would result in the formation of a long flank wall next to the boundary shared with No.39, the attached neighbouring house. This would have the effect of significantly enclosing the outdoor space immediately to the rear of No.39 and reducing outlook from, and natural light to, ground floor windows facing this space. Whilst I am satisfied that adequate levels of natural light would be maintained, the increased sense of enclosure resulting from the proposal would be oppressive.
9. Due to its siting and size I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.39. It therefore fails to accord with Local Plan Policy LP26 which requires that development does not result in an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

#### **Conclusions**

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

*S Poole*

INSPECTOR