



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025 by Andrew Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3355395

12 Almonds Avenue, Buckhurst Hill IG9 5JN

- 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 Mr Sultan Tasandere against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 2033/24.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage and rear extension. Construction of two-storey side extension, part two storey/part single storey rear extension with a pergola, alterations to the roof with loft conversion; detached outbuilding with a pergola/privacy screen; Front porch; formation of a new means of access to a highway and hard and soft landscaping works; erection of a 2m high side/rear boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling, characterised by a hipped main roof and a hipped lower roof over a double storey front projection. At the time of my visit, the building was covered with shrouded scaffolding.
6. Almonds Avenue comprises detached properties, each of which vary with respect to their form, scale and plot width. Notwithstanding this degree of individuality, the

prevalence of hipped roofs and a traditional palette of materials within the street scene unifies the buildings, positively contributing to the character to the road.

7. I am aware that the Council has approved an alternative application which contains some of the same elements as the appeal scheme, and for which the permission remains extant. From a review of the submitted evidence and the matters of dispute, I have no reason to disagree with the elements which are not in dispute between the Council and the Appellant. Therefore, my assessment will focus on the two-storey rear and side extensions together with the roof extension and alterations with loft conversion.
8. The proposed extensions would result in the formation of a crown hipped roof to the front, whilst a crown gable end would be created to the rear, below which would be two projecting gables linked by a further flat roof section. The development of this mixture of profiles would together add significant mass to the dwelling. In doing so, the scheme would introduce incongruous and bulky roof forms which do not respect the building's existing modest fully hipped appearance. The loss of the roof's hipped design would furthermore be contrary to the predominant character of development within the street and vicinity.
9. Owing to the construction of ridgelines at the same height as the existing apex, together with the gabled elements to the rear, the extensions would not be of a subordinate scale and form to the host dwelling. These elements, when combined with the flat roof sections, would fundamentally change the building's character, in doing so largely subsuming its existing form to the rear. A proposed Juliet balcony to the central upper gable to serve the loft conversion would furthermore contribute to a resulting top-heavy exterior, at odds with the property's current appearance.
10. Overall, and despite the stated incorporation of high-quality materials, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, which together set out requirements for new development to respect the local character of the area and for household extensions specifically to complement existing character in terms of scale, style and form, to be of a subordinate size, scale or height to the existing building and to incorporate a sympathetic roof profile. The extensions would also be contrary to the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document Guidance 2019, which advises that the roof design of two storey rear and side extensions should be of the same form to that of the existing house and that roof alterations should be subordinately sized.

Other Matters

11. The appellant's evidence refers to a variety of extensions to Nos 4 and 8 Almonds Avenue and Nos 2 and 3 Brancepeth Gardens. The appeal scheme, which has been assessed on its own merits, is however not closely comparable to each of these enlargements, due to both spatial considerations and the detailed design and form of the resultant developments. In addition, my attention has been drawn to a recent permission at No 16 Almonds Avenue for roof extensions and alterations including a loft conversion. Whilst I note similarities between the two schemes, this neighbouring property is of a larger existing size and different form to the appeal dwelling. As such, the circumstances at No 16 are materially different and do not justify harmful development at the appeal site.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR