
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 06 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3164735

70 Malford Grove, South Woodford, London E18 2DY

- 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 Kunal Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4637/16, dated 29 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is an alteration to form a side hip roof with dormer.
-

Procedural matters

1. The Council's Decision Notice and the appellant's Appeal Form describe the proposal as "single storey front extension incorporating new front porch, single and part double storey side and rear extension; conversion of garage into habitable room; alterations to roof and extension of existing loft conversion with side dormer". As this more accurately reflects the proposed development I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
2. Planning permission was granted on 5 August 2016 ref 2733/16 at the appeal site to "demolish side garage and adjoining structures; single storey front extension with a pergola; construct a 2 storey side and rear extension with a part pitched and hip roof construction, replace existing windows". I observed that work on this permission had commenced on site.
3. This appeal is related to another at the same address ref APP/W5780/D/16/3164644 for which there is a separate decision.

Decision

4. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issues

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. No 70 is a semi-detached house located in a predominantly residential area. This proposal seeks to amend planning permission ref. 2733/16 by proposing a pitched roof with a side dormer to the approved side extension in place of the approved hipped roof. The appellant pointed out that the house now has a gable wall to the loft conversion and it is necessary to alter the side extension
-

roof to meet the gable wall. The appellant argued that the proposed side extension roof dormer to pitched roof would be in keeping with the house and similar to the other properties of similar construction.

7. I note the Council's opinion that the proposal would not harmfully change the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings in respect of overlooking, overshadowing and loss of outlook, and from my assessment I have no reason to disagree. However, the Council raised concerns regarding the effect of the side extension on the character and appearance of the area.
8. While there are examples of different design treatments to side extension roofs in the general area, including at the neighbouring dwelling (no. 72), I consider that that pitched roofs with side dormers are not a defining characteristic of the area. In my judgement, the proposal would result in the roof of the side extension having an incongruous profile that would have a visually unbalancing effect on the pair of semi-detached houses when viewed from Malford Grove.
9. Accordingly, due to its bulk and appearance, the proposal would be a prominent and incongruous addition to the host building that would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. It would therefore conflict with Policies BD1 and BD5 of the Council's adopted Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 (which require proposals, inter alia, to be compatible with and contribute to the distinctive character of the area in which they are located and seek extensions that do not dominate existing buildings) and the broad aims of Policy SP3 of the adopted Core Strategy Development Plan Document.
10. While I find that the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings and noting that planning permission has been granted, or permitted development rights utilised, for similar forms of side dormers in the general area over recent years, in my judgement, taking this appeal on its individual merits, these considerations would not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and noting the appellant's frustration with how the Council handled the application, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard McCoy

INSPECTOR