

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3167029

11a Durham Avenue, Woodford Green, Essex, IG8 7NH.

- 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 Ms P Mosquera against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref: 3846/16, dated 27 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is conversion of roof space to habitable rooms to private dwelling bungalow.
-

Procedural Matter

1. Notwithstanding the description of the proposal cited in the header above (derived from the planning application forms), I consider a more accurate description is alteration from hipped roof to a mansard roof at rear.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alteration from hipped roof to a mansard roof at rear, at 11a Durham Avenue, Woodford Green, Essex, IG8 7NH, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 3846/16, dated 27 January 2016, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Page 1 of 4: Block Plan, Proposed Section and Unchanged Front View; Page 2 of 4: Rear View (Existing), Proposed Rear View and Proposed First Floor Plan; Page 3 of 4: Ground Floor Plan Unchanged, Existing Side View A, Proposed Side View A; Page 4 of 4: Roof Room Plan Existing, Proposed Side View B, Existing Side View; Site Location Plan 1:1250@A4.
 - 3) No development shall commence until samples or specifications of the tiles to be used in the external surfaces of the mansard roof hereby approved have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented using the approved materials.
-

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The Council concede that as the proposal would be situated to the rear of the property it would not be visible from the public domain. They nonetheless assert that it would amount to a disproportionate addition to the roof, which would compromise its appearance.
5. Whilst the mansard roof would amount to an unusual roof form which is not featured elsewhere in the locality, I nonetheless consider it would integrate satisfactorily with the host dwelling. This is because the existing hipped roof at the rear sits somewhat at odds with the more vertical plane of the substantial dormer/roof alteration which has been carried out to the side/rear of the property. The vertical face of the mansard roof and its steeper sides would arguably harmonise more readily with that extension, which it would be viewed against. Moreover, it would be seen in the context of a number of box dormers to other properties in the vicinity and would not therefore, look out of place.
6. Furthermore, it would not occupy the full width of the appeal property and sit no higher than the highest point of the existing roof. As such, it would appear as a relatively minor and subordinate addition thereto, which would not detract from its appearance or indeed, the visual amenities of the neighbouring properties, from which it would be seen.
7. For these reasons, I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would amount to an unremarkable addition to the host dwelling, which would integrate comfortably with it and the wider character and appearance of the locality. I thus find no conflict with Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) and Policies BD1 and BD5 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (2008). These seek to ensure that new development is of a high design quality, which is compatible with and contributes to the distinctive character and amenity of the area in which it is located and in the case of residential extensions, complements the character of the building in terms of scale, style and form.
8. In addition to the standard time limit condition for the commencement of development, the Council suggest conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and the use of matching materials. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt. The planning application forms specify concrete tiles and the re-use of existing tiles. Because of this and as the existing tiles to the roof are not of a single type, a matching materials condition is inappropriate and I shall instead require samples of materials to be submitted for approval, to ensure a satisfactory finish.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR