



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3362392

10 Sydney Road, Wanstead, London E11 2JW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Teresa Taylor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref. is 0208/25.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension at ground floor to extend existing kitchen and dining area. First floor extension to extend existing bathroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a rear extension at ground floor to extend the existing kitchen and dining area, and a first floor extension to extend the existing bathroom, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 0208/25 and the plans submitted with it, 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 be those specified in the application form;
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No. Series DVZ046: Plan Nos. 01 P2; 02 P2; 03 P4; 10; 12P1; 25P2; 26P1 & 27P2.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The Council's Notice of Refusal refers to the flat roof of the proposed first floor rear extension as an intrusive and incongruous addition out of character with the existing and surrounding dwellings. It is considered that this would have a serious and adverse effect on the visual amenity of the locality.
4. However, the proposed first floor extension would be of a modest size. It would have a width only slightly more than half of the rear wall and a height that would adjoin the eaves of the two storey dwelling. It would almost certainly not be visible from the public realm.

5. By way of contrast, I was able to observe from the rear garden of No.10 several examples of dormer extensions with much larger flat roofs on nearby houses and their outriggers and occupying the full extent of the roof planes up to the ridge. These are identified on the appellant's statement and form just a few of the 21 properties within a 50m radius of the appeal dwelling that have a first or second floor outrigger extension with a flat roof combined with a dormer extension. With their height and bulk the extensions closest to No. 10 dominate the outlook from the back garden.
6. As regards the much more restrained appeal scheme itself, the appeal statement also identifies 10 properties within the aforementioned 50m radius that have exactly the same flat roof design to the one now proposed in this appeal. I acknowledge the point made in the Officer's Report that the proposed flat roof would not comply with the Council's Housing Design SPD guidance, but the grounds of appeal explain why a pitched roof would be impractical in this case.
7. Be that as it may, I consider the determining factor in this case is that with the dominance of far larger and higher flat roof extensions at nearby properties and with the number of flat roof extensions within a 50m radius, it cannot reasonably be argued that the appeal scheme '*would be an intrusive and incongruous addition out of character with the existing and surrounding dwellings*' or indeed that the proposal '*would have a serious and adverse effect on the visual amenity of the locality*'.
8. Accordingly, I find that there would not be any harmful conflict with Policies LP26 & LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 adopted March 2018 or with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework revised in December 2024.
9. I shall therefore allow the appeal and impose conditions in respect of external materials and compliance with the approved plans to safeguard visual amenity and for the avoidance of doubt.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR