

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3166317
70 Ewellhurst Road, Clayhall IG5 0PB

- 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 Saifur Choudhury against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3454/16 was refused by notice dated 13 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as 'Proposing the build side dormer with flat roof and front small dormer with pitched roof like neighbouring property.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The submitted drawings were amended during the Council's consideration of the application by reducing the size of the side dormer and excluding the originally proposed front addition. It is this revised scheme that is the subject of the appeal.
3. The Appellant has explained that the name given on the Appeal form is incorrect. It should have been as indicated on the application form and I have therefore used this in the above heading.

Main issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the locality and streetscene.

Reasons

5. The aims of London Borough of Redbridge, Borough Wide Primary Policies, Development Plan Document (PPDPD), May 2008, Policy BD5 include that dormer windows should not dominate the existing roof profile, with side dormers not occupying more than 25% of the roof face. Extensions should complement the character of the building in terms of matters such as scale and form.
 6. The Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), Adopted January 2012, includes advice on dormer windows and it is pointed out that such development can have a serious impact on the
-

appearance of a house due to its prominent position. It is advised that the design should respect the original dwelling and the character of the streetscape. Among other things, such extensions should be set a minimum of a metre above the eaves, while flat roof box dormers can often appear bulky.

7. The appeal concerns a detached bungalow in a street where development in the vicinity on both sides is characterised by such properties. The Appellant refers to a number of side dormer extensions that have been built in the road and suggests that the proposed development would not be significantly different. It is also pointed out that the immediately adjacent dwellings at nos. 68 and 72 both have such roof extensions.
8. The host property has an existing dormer addition that wraps around the side and rear of the property. The proposal is for the construction of a dormer extension to the other side. It would be set on the front face of the roof of the gable ended side projection and on a side facing slope of the main roof, extending across the junction of these slopes.
9. The Appellant has provided calculations on the submitted drawings but these concern volumes. Determining the extent to which an individual roof slope or face would be covered or occupied by the extension is a question of area and not volume. Given the fairly modest gaps to the ridge and gable end at the side, as well as virtually abutting the eaves, it is clear that the front facing slope or roof face of the side projection would be occupied to a substantially greater extent than 25%.
10. The addition would also be set on a side slope where I calculate that any conflict with the 25% criterion would be fairly marginal. Nevertheless, given the extent in relation to the other face, with the roof profile being unacceptably dominated, there would be conflict with Policy BD5 6) anyway. Furthermore, this adverse effect would also be prominent in views from the street.
11. The dominance in the front facing slope, as well as spanning two roof faces, would reflect the excessive scale of the addition. The flat top form would also be at odds with the pitched roof form and character of the original building, which is unchanged at this side. The failure to complement the character of the building in these respects would be contrary to Policy BD5 1).
12. While there are a number of side dormer additions in the street, I saw at my visit that the majority of bungalows have not been extended in this manner. Moreover, the majority of these enlarged properties only have such development to one side, such as the immediately adjacent dwelling at no. 72. While some properties, including the neighbouring dwelling at no. 68, have such extensions at both sides, these are relatively unusual in the context of the street as a whole. As a result, the prevailing roof form of the bungalows is sloping rather than flat.
13. In this instance the proposed development would result in flat roof additions on both sides. Specific reference is made to dormer extensions being permitted by the Council at 11, 57 and 76 Ewellhurst Road. However, two of these only have such development at a single side and can therefore be distinguished from this case. In any event, I have not been provided with the full details and background to these cases. I do not therefore know the reasons why these developments were accepted and it has not been shown that the Council's decision making has been unreasonably inconsistent. Moreover, in my view

much of the development that has been built illustrates the disharmonious effect such alterations can have and should not be used to justify development that would further diminish the quality of the environment.

14. Despite the extensions that have been built and because of factors such as its position, size and flat roof form, the proposed extension would be an overly bulky and intrusive feature out of scale and character with the host dwelling. Moreover, it would also be a discordant feature given the prevailing sloping roof form of the bungalows in the street. This would be the case despite the use of materials to match the original dwelling and neighbouring properties.
15. For the above reasons, it is concluded that the development would harm the character and appearance of the locality and the streetscene. Such detrimental effects and the proximity to the eaves would be at odds with the SPD. The failure to contribute to local architecture and respect the amenity of the locality would be contrary to these aims of PPDPD Policy BD1 and London Borough of Redbridge, Core Strategy, March 2008, Strategic Policy 3.
16. I am reinforced in my view regarding the adverse impact of the development by the importance placed on design in the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework). It is a core principle of the Framework that planning should always seek to secure high quality design. Moreover, it is indicated in the Framework that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning, which would not be achieved in this instance.
17. The Appellant points out that there have been no objections to the planning application from neighbours. However, I must consider this appeal strictly on its planning merits and this is not a matter that confers acceptability.
18. Given the harm that would result and taking account of all other matters raised, it is therefore determined that the appeal fails.

M Evans

INSPECTOR