



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2019

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3238808

16 Belvedere Avenue, Clayhall, Ilford IG5 0UE

- 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 Sunjiv Dembla and Karishma Dembla against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2130/19, dated 16 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as a "dormer loft extension within the pitch roof."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a residential area which features dwellings of mixed scale and appearance. Many nearby dwellings appear to have been extended and altered and include accommodation within the roof space. Roof extensions at the rear of dwellings within Belvedere Avenue, Dunspring Lane and Ashley Avenue can be seen from surrounding roads.
5. The semi-detached dwelling at the appeal site is the last of a string of 8 dwellings which appear to have had a similar scale and appearance originally, albeit most now have projections to the side which are of inconsistent form and appearance. The side projection at the appeal site continues to the rear and, as such, pitched roofs project to the side and rear of the main part of the dwelling. The dwelling also features a single storey extension and a conservatory to the rear. None of the string of 8 dwellings feature rear dormers.

6. The proposal would see the addition of a dormer roof extension to the rear of the dwelling and roof lights to the front, side and rear of the roof. Due to the positioning of the dormer and the presence of the extension at the side of the dwelling, the dormer would only be partially visible from the public domain of Belvedere Road. It would, however, be seen from within the gardens and dwellings of neighbouring properties to the side and rear of the site.
7. The proposed dormer would be a large addition to the roof of the dwelling that would have a substantial bulk and mass due to its shape. The size of the dormer and its positioning relative to the eaves, the ridge and the boundary that is shared with the attached neighbouring dwelling would cause the dormer to have a dominating effect on the existing roof and the appearance of the dwelling. As the dwelling already features various roof planes and projections to the side and rear, the addition of the proposed dormer would cause the resultant building to have a contrived and incongruous appearance. It would also introduce a new feature to the group of 8 similar dwellings in a manner that would not be complimentary to the appearance of that group.
8. Whilst dormer roof extensions are a common feature of the wider area and some appear to be of similar size to the dormer that is part of this proposal, I have few details of the planning history of those dormers and as such am only able to give their presence minimal weight. In any event, those that I could see appeared to be the only projection from the main part of the dwelling and therefore the extensions remain proportionate to the original dwelling. Conversely, the combination of the proposed development and the other projections at the side and rear of the dwelling at the appeal site would cause the dwelling to have an unduly busy appearance that would not be comparable to other developments in the surrounding area.
9. The development would therefore be contrary to policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (RLP), adopted 2018, which combine to require that development, amongst other things, is of high quality design, respects local character, complements the existing building in terms of scale, style, form and materials, is subordinate to the existing building and incorporates a roof profile that is sympathetic to the existing building. The development would also conflict with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which require development to be of high quality in terms of design and architecture.
10. As policy LP33 of the RLP relates to heritage assets it does not appear to be relevant to the assessment of this proposal.

Conclusion

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

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR