
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by S D Harley BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI ARICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3161597

64B Mulberry Way, South Woodford, London E18 1ED

- 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 Geoffrey Salmon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3723/16, dated 18 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 Sept 2016.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion to first floor flat, rear dormer and ridge raised 900mm.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The proposed development as described on the planning application form is set out above. The Council on the decision notice describes the proposal as "Raise ridge 900mm. Loft conversion with rear dormer. Hip to gable roof alteration. Three front roof lights. New window to gable end". This more fully describes the proposals as shown on the submitted plans and is therefore preferred.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for: the raising of the ridge by 900mm; loft conversion with rear dormer; hip to gable roof alteration; three front roof lights; and window to gable end at 64B Mulberry Way, South Woodford, London E18 1ED in accordance with the application Ref 3723/16, dated 18 July 2016, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan 5.7.A dated June 2016.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

3. The main issue for this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

4. Mulberry Way is in a predominantly residential area. Properties on the street are of varied styles, shapes and heights. The appeal site is one of two flats in
-

an end of terrace, wide, two storey building of unique and asymmetrical design. Its main roof has a shallow hip shape to one side and a gable detail to the other; it has two very differently shaped two storey bay windows to the front, one of which appears to be part of a flat roofed side extension; and a rear two storey hipped roof projection. The adjoining house at No 62a is also two storey but is much narrower and has a gable feature facing Mulberry Way. The houses at Nos 48 to 62 (evens) are three storeys high with steeper, tall gables facing the street. On the other side of the appeal site are two storey houses that have pitched roofs with the ridges parallel to the street and gables to the sides. On the opposite side of the street is a hipped roof bungalow with a dormer window facing Mulberry Way.

5. The proposed raising of the roof and altering the hip to a gable would add to the bulk of the building. However, given the variation of styles and heights, even though the proposed ridge would be higher than that of properties to the north east, the resulting roof shape and size of building would not be particularly prominent or intrusive given the varied character of other properties on the street. Nor do I consider that the existing roof shape is of such architectural merit that it would warrant protection for its own sake.
6. The proposed rear dormer would be set in from the sides, eaves and ridge of the proposed roof and would be tile clad. In these ways it would not significantly conflict with the criteria for dormers set out in Policy BD5(6) of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 (the PPD) even though it would cover some 45% of the proposed rear roof slope¹ which slightly exceeds the 40% threshold sought by the Policy. During my visit I observed a number of other dormers some of which are more prominent than the proposed dormer would be. I conclude that the dormer would not be so over dominant in relation to the size of No 64 or so out of keeping with the local area as to justify refusal.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, on balance, I conclude that although the proposed development would change the shape of the roof it would not be so intrusive or so harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene or the host property as to justify refusal. Accordingly I conclude it would not conflict with those aspects of Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2008 or Policies BD1 or BD5 of the BPPD that seek to ensure developments respect the character and appearance of the local area and host building in terms of scale, style and size. Taking into account all other relevant matters raised I conclude the appeal should succeed.
8. As well as the standard condition specifying the time limits for the commencement of development compliance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. The materials should match the existing in the interests of the appearance of the area.

SDHarley

INSPECTOR

¹ Council Appeal Statement Paragraph 2.1