



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3338828

53 King's Avenue, Woodford Green, Redbridge, IG8 0JF

- 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 Mohammed Uddin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3331/23, dated 1 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of 53 King's Avenue and the Woodford Broadway Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached dwelling occupying a corner plot where Queen's Avenue joins King's Avenue and within a residential suburb which forms part of the Woodford Broadway Conservation Area (CA). The area comprises mostly high-quality early 20th Century and inter-war detached and semi-detached dwellings. No 53 is an individually styled dwelling with a mix of low-pitched roofs with single-storey eaves heights and full two-storey gable features, including previous extensions, finished with a mix of white painted render and tile-hanging, and matching roof tiles. Despite a rather incongruous, linked garage extension to the front and side nearest to the boundary with 46 Queen's Avenue, I share the Council's view that the appeal property makes a positive contribution to the CA, being a quality building amongst its contemporaries. The proposal would replace two, side projecting two-storey gabled extensions and the garage with a new, two-storey side extension.
4. The Council's *Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) was adopted in 2019. It deals with two-storey side extensions at section 3.5 and advises that their height, width, and overall scale should be proportionate and subordinate to the dimensions and scale of the host property. To achieve this, it advises that the width of an extension should not exceed half the width of the host property and that the ridge should be set down from the height of the main ridge. It further advises that the roof of the extension should be designed in the same form as the main roof.

5. Although the proposed addition would match the ridge height of the existing extensions, and main ridge, it would be considerably less recessed and would by far exceed half the width of the property. In addition, the crown and hipped form of its roof would be significantly at odds with the existing roof configuration. By failing to appear proportionate and subordinate to the host property, there would be clear conflict with the SPD's guiding principles. Additionally, the proposed fenestration pattern in terms of detailing and proportions would equally show little regard to the existing, and inconsistencies within the application drawings creates a degree of uncertainty about retention of some key features. This further indicates to me an overall lack of consideration for the detailed architectural composition of the original dwelling.
6. I do not know the background or history to the existing extensions to the side of No 53. However, they appeared to me as a pair of proportionate and well-integrated gabled additions, deeply recessed behind the main front elevation which faces Queen's Avenue, and respectful of the dwelling's original composition. In contrast, I find the proposed side extension would be seen as an overly wide, bulky, and dominant addition that would show little respect for the scale, form, or appearance of the original dwelling. As such, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of 53 King's Avenue. As a building that currently makes a positive contribution to the area, it follows that the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
7. Having regard to paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the harm arising from the proposal to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial. However, this does not equate to a less than substantial objection and any harm to a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification in line with paragraph 206. Furthermore, in line with the Framework's paragraph 208, such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
8. Given the statutory duty set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, I have attached significant weight to the harm that I have identified to the historic environment.
9. The appellant has argued that the proposal would bring benefits by partially obscuring the exposed flank wall of the neighbouring property at 46 Queen's Avenue and that it would remove unsightly parts of the present building. I accept that there is some merit to these arguments, however the weight I attribute to any public benefit from the appeal proposal in this regard is only minimal and is insufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified from the proposal to the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of 53 King's Avenue and the Woodford Broadway Conservation Area. As such, there would be conflict with Policy HC1 of The London Plan 2021 and Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 March 2018. Between them these policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development proposals including household extensions, display a quality of design that respects the character of an existing building and an

area's local character, and which conserves and enhances the character and significance of the historic environment. Accordingly, having regard to the conflict with the development plan and national policy, and all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR