
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2023

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/23/3318000

45 Rokeby Gardens, Woodford Green, London, IG8 9HR

- 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 Tim Neil against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3820/22, dated 25 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with hip to gable roof extension, rear facing dormer, three windows and demolition of rear chimney stack.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with hip to gable roof extension, rear facing dormer, three windows and demolition of rear chimney stack at 45 Rokeby Gardens, Woodford Green, London, IG8 9HR in accordance with the terms of the application 3820/22, dated 25 November 2022, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 666/01, 666/02, 666/03, 666/04, 666/05, 666/06, 666/07, 666/08, 666/09

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 3. The property has been extended in the past with a side extension and single storey extension to the rear. The proposals would see the hipped side extension altered to a gable end. I saw at my site visit that the original design of the inter-War housing in the vicinity, termed the Laing's Estate Residential Precinct, evidently saw hipped roofs but many properties have been altered and extended to the side and at roof level. These changes have included new gable ends, yet even with these changes the general form, spacious character and consistency to the appearance of the Estate remains. Although I understand some of these changes have come about through permitted
-

- development rights, the fact remains that these alterations still form and contribute to what defines the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposals in this appeal would be a change that sits comfortably within this area: there would be sufficient spacing to the adjoining house to ensure no undue terracing effect, and given the degree of change in the area the lack of symmetry with the adjoining semi-detached house would not be intrusive. Thus, the character of the area would be retained.
 5. The rear dormer would be set down from the ridgeline, and set in from the eaves, party wall and side elevation of the property. There would be an absence of visibility from public views and hence it would not impose upon the street scene. When seen from the rear the dormer, and the enlarged roof through the hip to gable extension, would appear proportionate to the host property and hence would appear a suitable addition. The position of the dormer would not be imposing upon the outlook from adjoining properties, and no material change to levels of overlooking would occur.
 6. Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 seek to ensure that, amongst other matters, all new development including extensions are of a high quality design, maintains the quality of the street scene, complements and is subordinate to the building, and maintains spacing. Similar objectives are set out in the Council's Housing Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2019. For the reasons given, the proposals would be consistent with these policy objectives, and so on the main issue it is concluded there would not be harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 7. The appeal is therefore allowed. The Council have suggested a number of conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. I have attached a condition requiring matching materials, to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development. I have also attached a condition specifying the approved plans in the interest of precision.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR