

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2017

by Jameson Bridgwater PGDipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3166981

9 Eastwood Road, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 8UW

- 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 J Oddi against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4135/16, dated 26 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed formation of new second floor studio flat unit within the existing roof space'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. Eastwood Road is characterised by its coherently developed built form that has largely retained its original hipped roofscape on both front, side and rear elevations. The creation of the proposed studio flat would involve the addition of 3 dormers, of which 1 would be sited at the rear and 2 on the side roof planes of the host property.
 4. I accept based on the evidence before me and my observations at my site visit that the proposed rear dormer by reason of its size, design and siting would not result in material harm to the character and appearance to the host dwelling or the area. However, whilst the proposed side facing dormers would not appear to exceed the 25% threshold in relation to the roof face, they would appear unduly dominant and fail to relate to the host dwelling or the street scene by way of their design and prominent location. Therefore, introduction of the size and siting of the 2 side facing dormers within the context of a consistent and largely unaltered roofscape would result in an incongruous addition that would materially harm the character and appearance of both the host property and the area. In reaching this conclusion I have taken account of the potential addition of a studio flat to the supply of housing, however, given that I have found that the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area, it does not lead me to a different conclusion.
-

5. Having come to the conclusions above, the proposal would therefore be in conflict with Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy DPD and Policies BD1 and BD5 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies DPD, which seek amongst other things ensure that development would be compatible with and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the area in which it is located and complement the character of the building, particularly in terms of scale, style, form and materials.
6. The appellant refers to another dormer extension in the area and cites this as setting a precedent for this proposal. However, I have limited information about its history, but inevitably its context would differ to that of the scheme before me, and so it does not lead me to a different view in this case.

Conclusion

7. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jameson Bridgwater

INSPECTOR