
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2017

by A J Mageean BA (Hons) BPI PhD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3167726

153 Clayhall Avenue, Barkingside, Ilford, Essex IG5 0NZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Fraser against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4534/16 is dated 22 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of first floor side and rear extensions. Loft conversion with rear box dormer assembly and roof windows to front pitch/slope. Hipped roof to gable end.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Whilst the appeal is made against the failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission, the Council has provided an appeal statement in which it sets out its objections. Therefore, on the evidence before me, the main issue is:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a traditional two storey semi-detached property located within a mature residential area. Clayhall Avenue and surrounding streets are characterised by properties of similar design and size. Many have been extended, with side extensions as well as side and rear dormer additions visible in surrounding streets. The appeal dwelling itself has a single storey side and rear extension, and shares a front first floor extension with its neighbour. For the most part though the characteristic scale and height of these buildings, including their hipped roofs, remains intact.
 4. The proposal would include first floor additions to the side and rear of this dwelling, and the conversion of the loft to create a further bedroom/bathroom. This latter element would involve a hip to gable extension and the addition of a large dormer on the rear roof slope. The Council estimates that the dormer would occupy around 75% of the roof face. It would have the same height as the existing roof ridge. The overall impact of the proposed additions would be to substantially erode the roof form of this dwelling, which, whilst retaining the
-

front roof slope, would replace its simple hip with a complicated arrangement involving the dormer, a side partly flat roofed gable, and a rear hip projection.

5. The Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies DPD 2008 (BWPP) Policy BD5 states that planning permission will only be granted where extensions *incorporate a roof profile sympathetic to the existing building, and where dormer windows do not dominate the existing roof profile (rear dormers do not occupy more than 40% of the roof face), nor rise above or break the existing ridgeline or hip to the roof (and) are set in approximately one metre from each boundary.*
6. The proposal would clearly breach this policy in relation to the size of the dormer, its position close to the boundary with No 151 and the loss of the hip. Overall the bulk of the building would be substantially increased when viewed in the local street scene, including oblique views of the rear from Couchmore Avenue. In this respect the harm to the characteristic qualities of the dwelling and the local street scene would be unacceptable.
7. The appellant has referred to similar developments approved by the Council by providing photographs, though no details of the locations or circumstances of these examples are given so it is difficult to draw comparisons. Furthermore the existence of other large extensions in the locality does not justify the harm I have identified in the present case.
8. I conclude that this proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. It would conflict with the BWPP Policies BD1 and BD5 and the Redbridge Core Strategy DPD 2008 Policy SP3 which, taken together, require a high standard of design.

Conclusion

9. As material considerations do not indicate that I should conclude other than in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole, the appeal is dismissed.

AJ Mageean

INSPECTOR