



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2019 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3235681

24 Onslow Gardens, South Woodford, London E18 1NE

- 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 & Mrs Paul Jordan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2313/19, dated 24 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2019.
 - The proposed development is a rear dormer on existing side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the western side of Onslow Gardens. The appeal property has been subject to a two-storey side extension and hip-to-gable roof extension, with a large rear dormer situated within the rear roofslope. The proposed dormer would be situated above the two-storey side extension around 0.8m from the existing dormer, although they would be partially connected to each other below the roof ridge. It would have a much narrower width than the existing dormer and would appear as an asymmetrical addition. Due to its width, positioning and resulting design, the proposal would contrast poorly with the existing dormer and appear as an incongruous addition to the rear roofslope. As such, the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
 5. The appellant states that a previous application had been refused due to its bulky size and overall massing, and that this proposal has been designed to respond to these issues. However, the full details of this previous application are not before me to consider and in any case, each appeal must be considered on its own merits.
-

6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018), which states that proposals must respect the local character of the area. It would also conflict with the Householder Design Guide SPD (2012), which states that dormers should respect the original dwelling and be located symmetrically on the roof.

Other Matters

7. The appellant states that they require more space for their family and that they are not financially able to move to another larger property. While I note these personal circumstances, I do not consider that they outweigh the harm that would be caused by the proposal as identified above.
8. It is acknowledged that no objections have been submitted from neighbours. Regardless, this does not justify the harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR