
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 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 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3175916

34 Parklands Close, Newbury Park, Ilford IG2 7QR

- 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 Dhiresan Gadiagellen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0421/17, dated 30 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Dhiresan Gadiagellen against the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Parklands Close is a cul-de-sac of two and three storey terraced properties of similar design and appearance. They are characterised by steeply pitched roofs, a number of which have rear dormer extensions. No 34 is a modestly sized two storey mid-terrace property. It is within the group of houses located towards the head of the Close which are stepped in to reflect the narrowing of the Close at this point.
5. The London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (BWPP) Policy BD5 requires that dormer windows do not dominate the existing roof profile. As such they should not occupy more than 40% of the area and be set in by approximately 1m from each boundary. The Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2012 reiterates this Policy, though suggests that dormers should be set a minimum of 0.5m below the ridgeline.
6. The proposed rear dormer would occupy most of the rear roof slope of this dwelling, with the Council noting that it would be set in around 0.2m from the

side boundaries, eaves and ridge, occupying a little over 70% of the roof area. Whilst I accept that it would be set down slightly from the ridge level and would use complementary materials it would nonetheless be an over-dominant addition, out of scale with the modest size of the host dwelling. Whilst its position at the rear of the building would limit its views in the public realm to some degree, the stepped nature of the building line between No 32 and No 34 would mean that some of the bulk and height of this addition would be visible in south western views along the Close, further adding to the harm identified.

7. I agree that as the front facing velux windows would be flush with the roof slope they would be a discrete addition which would not cause harm to the townscape.
8. I noted on my site visit that there are dormer extensions to No's 32 and 36 on either side of the appeal site. I am unaware of the circumstances of these cases, however that at No 32 is of modest size. Whilst the dormer at No 36 is of significant size it appears to be slightly smaller than proposed in the present case. Furthermore neither of these additions is significantly visible in public views. Other rear dormers within the local area are also referred to by the appellant. Again, I am unaware of the full details of these cases, including their approved sizes. It is possible that larger additions were approved prior to the adoption of the BWPP. As the present policy has been put into place to protect the character of local buildings and areas, I do not accept that the presence of existing large dormers sets a precedent for the present case.
9. The appellant makes particular reference to the approval at appeal of a rear dormer at No 31 Parklands Close¹. However, the Council states that in this case the size of the dormer is 40% and therefore does not breach the requirements of Policy BD5. As this is of a more appropriate size than the present proposal the Council did not have concerns in relation to its visual impact on the host building or wider area. The fact that this proposal was allowed at appeal following the review by the Inspector of concerns which have not been raised in the present case means that these cases are not directly comparable. Reference is also made to another appeal decision in which a rear dormer addition is allowed², though no details of the size of this addition are given, in contrast with the present case the Inspector notes that the design is in keeping with the character of the house. I therefore do not accept that this example sets a precedent for the present case.
10. I conclude that this proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. In this respect it would conflict with the BWPP Policy BP5, and additionally BWPP Policy BP1 and the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2008) Policy SP3, which together seek to secure high quality design that contributes to the locality. It would also conflict with the SPD.
11. 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

¹ APP/W5780/D/16/3143458

² APP/Z5630/D/15/3006057