
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/17/3173479

23A, Kingsley Road, Hainault, Ilford IG6 2LL

- 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 Novruz Haxhia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 5587/16, dated 30 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is retention of dormer to loft room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The dwelling is an end of terrace property comprising of two storeys with living accommodation in the roof, which is served by roof lights to the front roof plane and the dormer to the rear. The enlarged dormer has already been constructed. Permission was granted for the property in 2014 which included a rear dormer in this location, but one which was smaller in size and would not extend as far along the roof in terms of width or depth.
4. Whilst a dormer has been approved in this location, I consider that the enlarged dormer results in an over dominant feature when viewed in the context of the dwelling as a whole. The dormer extends the full width of the roof and extends almost the whole depth. This results in a large area of flat roof which serves to dominate and unbalance the dwelling. Furthermore, neither dwelling either side of the appeal site has a rear dormer which serves to make it all the more prominent.
5. The dormer is located to the rear of the existing dwelling and given the location of the adjoining dwellings and the existing vegetation to the rear boundary the development would only be glimpsed from the public realm, but when seen from neighbouring properties and gardens, by virtue of its size and width, it dominates the rear roof slope of the terrace and unbalances the appearance of the appellant's dwelling.

6. I note the other examples of similar rear dormers along Kingsley Road, some of which were partly visible from the rear garden of No. 23. However, I do not know the specific circumstances behind these developments. Whilst these introduce the character of rear dormers to this area in general terms, this does not outweigh my concerns over the overall size and scale of the dormer in relation to the existing dwelling.
7. Given the above considerations the dormer is harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. As such, the development fails to comply with Policies BD1 and BD5 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document which seek to ensure that development complements the character of the building and that dormers do not dominate the existing roof profile. In addition, the development fails to comply with Strategic Policy 3 of the Redbridge Core Strategy which seeks to ensure the built environment is of a high quality. Furthermore, the development is in conflict with the Householder Design Guide Supplementary Design Guide which requires the design of dormers to respect the original dwelling. Therefore the development does not accord with the development plan as a whole. The development is also in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be of a good design.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR