



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2019

by M Heron BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3237218 10 The Dell, Woodford Green IG8 0QL

- 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 R Choudhary against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2725/19, dated 17 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is alterations to the roof and front and rear dormers. One rear, five front and two side roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The Dell is a residential street within a suburban area. It is characterised by two storey dwellings constructed in a variety of architectural styles under a mix of roof types. No 10 is a large, detached, dwelling which, like several other nearby properties, has been extended over time. Its considerable size occupies a significant amount of the width of its wide plot. However, its roof proportions are appropriate and are similar to surrounding dwellings. Consequently, No 10 harmonises with surrounding built form.
4. The proposal seeks planning permission to alter the roof of No 10 to facilitate, amongst other things, a double height entrance hall and a partial loft extension. Replacement dormer windows are proposed to front and rear and new roof lights would be added at the rear, front and side of the property.
5. In my view, proposed alterations to the rear of the host property would be acceptable. In addition, the scale and positioning of the replacement dormer windows would be appropriate and suitable materials could be secured for them through the imposition of an appropriately worded condition. Nevertheless, the proposal would result in the creation of a large catslide roof to the front of No 10. This would cover a significant proportion of the width of its principal elevation. Whilst the gabled element would remain, the new roofscape would be excessive and would unduly dominate the appearance of the host property when viewed from The Dell. Moreover, the amount of roofing to front would be considerably greater than, and therefore out of character with, the roof proportions of surrounding properties.

6. Furthermore, although the footprint and height of No 10 would not be altered, the proposal would extend the property towards the carriageway at first floor level. This would exacerbate its already considerable bulk and mass, to the further detriment of its design and the appearance of the streetscene.
7. The proposal would not impact upon a historic environment. Nonetheless, taking all of the above into account, I consider that it would fail to integrate effectively with the design of No 10 and would also appear visually intrusive and discordant within the streetscene. Its harmful impact would be readily apparent from the public domain.
8. I accept that the individual design of the new roof lights would be acceptable. However, together, the five rooflights within the catslide roof would unacceptably draw the eye to the incongruity of the new roofscape. I also appreciate that the proposal would improve the quality of accommodation for the appellant's family. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to show that this could not be achieved through a scheme which would be less harmful to the appearance of No 10 and that of the surrounding area. This is therefore not a reason to set aside the identified harm.
9. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (LP). Amongst other things, these require extensions to compliment the character of the host building and incorporate a roof profile that is sympathetic to the existing dwelling and that developments respect and improve the quality of the area. I have also been referred to Policy LP33 of the LP. However, this deals with the historic environment and is not relevant to this main issue.
10. Turning to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the proposal would not conflict with its social objective of ensuring that developments foster a safe built environment. However, I have found that the scheme would not be of a high architectural quality or be sympathetic to local character. There is therefore conflict with the environmental objective of the Framework insofar as it seeks to ensure that developments contribute to protecting and enhancing the built environment.

Other Matter

11. With regard to the nature of the appeal scheme and the relationship of No 10 with surrounding properties, it would not result in harm to the living conditions at surrounding properties. However, this is a requirement of the development plan. It is therefore not a reason to permit a scheme which would harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in the manner identified above.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the advice of the Framework, which outweigh this conflict. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Heron

INSPECTOR