



## 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: 06 January 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3235460**

**65 High View Road, South Woodford, London E18 2HL**

- 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 Paul Butcher against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref 1705/19, dated 16 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2019.
  - The development was originally described as pitched roof to rear extension and introduction of new dormer at roof level.
- 

### 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.

### Procedural Matter

3. The above description of the development is taken from the application form. However, from both my site visit and the evidence before me, it is clear that the appeal property has been subject to a hip-to-gable roof extension over the existing two-storey side extension. In their statement, the appellant asserts that the hip-to-gable roof extension complies with Class B, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the 'GPDO'), and so retrospective permission is sought for only the pitched roof over the first-floor rear extension and the rear dormer. However, the appellant also says that the hip-to-gable roof extension and rear dormer were, for practical reasons, constructed at the same time. The appellant states that the cumulative volume of all the roof alterations exceeds the 50 cubic metres limit in the GPDO. It would be inappropriate to choose which of the simultaneous roof alterations should be considered permitted development, and which should be subject of the planning application, and hence this appeal. As such, I consider it correct to consider all the roof alterations together, as the Council have done, in this appeal.

### Main Issue

4. 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

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the western side of High View Road. As well as the aforementioned alterations a single-storey rear extension has been built<sup>1</sup> and a raised patio has been constructed at ground-floor level. High View Road is broadly characterised by pairs of two-storey dwellinghouses which are visibly separate. While there are some examples of hip-to-gable extensions, which are set below the main roof ridge hence giving a sense of subordination; properties in the area generally feature hipped roofs, providing space between the pairs at roof level. As the hip-to-gable roof extension at the appeal property is not set down from the main roof ridge, it does not have an appropriately subordinate appearance. This aspect of the development contrasts poorly, and results in an asymmetrical relationship, with No. 63, the adjoining property, which does have a hip-to-gable extension that is clearly subservient to the proportions of the host dwelling. Furthermore, due to its proximity to No. 67 at roof-level, the hip-to-gable roof extension erodes the gap to No 67 and creates a terracing effect which undermines an established characteristic of the surrounding area.
6. While I recognise that there are varying examples of side and roof extensions in the area, they each appear subservient to their host properties. The, examples of hip-to-gable roof extensions at Nos 40, 46, 61 & 63 visibly step down from the main roof ridge and appear as subordinate additions. The lack of a step down in the development therefore contrasts with these.
7. At the rear, the dormer extension appears overly dominant within the roofslope due to its substantial width and the lack of a sufficient set back from the shared boundary with No. 63. I note that there are a number of dormers in the immediate area, including at No 63. Regardless, each appeal must be considered on its merits, and in this case the dormer window appears disproportionately large due to its scale and positioning within the roofslope. The dormer also conflicts with the guidance included within the Householder Design Guide SPD (2012), which requires that dormers should be set back 1m from the shared boundary of a semi-detached dwelling.
8. Although the appellant asserts that they had followed the Council's advice, it is clear that officers had advised the appellant to submit a householder application for the rear dormer and pitched roof over the first-floor rear extension once the hip-to-gable extension had been completed. As noted above, the appellant states all works were completed together, contrary to the Council's advice.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The development therefore conflicts with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018), which state that proposals must respect the local character of the area and that extensions should be subordinate to the existing building. It also conflicts with the Householder Design Guide SPD (2012), which states that dormers should respect the original dwelling.

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning permission Ref No 5526/17

### **Other Matters**

10. The Council have raised some concern with the raised patio constructed to the rear of the appeal property, although they are not specific in terms of how this aspect of the development is unneighbourly. However, it is not considered that the patio causes unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, as some mutual overlooking into neighbouring gardens and rear-facing conservatory windows would have already existed prior to the development.
11. Also, though the rear hipped roof extension may have improved the appearance of part of the dwelling, this does not justify the harm resulting from the development as a whole.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

12. 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**

13. 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