The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3238755
6 Meadway, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9BG

- 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 Shubber Raja against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
- The application Ref 2579/19, dated 24 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2019.
- The development proposed is the enlargement of existing roof.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the enlargement of existing roof at 6 Meadway, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9BG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2579/19, dated 24 July 2019, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

    2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Numbers 19/0580/PL – 1; 19/0580/PL – 2; 19/0580/PL – 3; 19/0580/PL – 4; 19/0580/PL – 5; 19/0580/PL – 6; 19/0580/PL – 7; 19/0580/PL – 8; 19/0580/PL – 9; 19/0580/PL – 10; 19/0580/PL – 11;19/0580/PL - 12.

    3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area and the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on Meadway, within a residential area. It comprises a bungalow with associated driveway and rear garden. The design of the existing property is not wholly representative of the surrounding properties and although there is a degree of coherence along the road, the designs and scales of the properties are reasonably varied. Many of the ridge heights of the properties are higher than the existing bungalow and many of the properties

have front dormers. The site falls within the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area which is characterised by varied dwelling designs, sizes and scales, with variations in roof design also.

4. The property has an extant planning permission for the enlargement of the existing roof.[1] This followed a previous approval for the alteration of the roof from hip to gable to both sides[2]. The appeal proposal seeks to further increase the height of the main roof, whilst also extending the roof above the existing side, flat roofed extension. It would also involve the introduction of rooflights into the front roof plane.

5. The proposed alterations would result in an increase in ridge height of around 0.5 metres over the approved scheme, which has yet to be implemented. The appeal property is located between a bungalow and a two-storey property. Therefore, whilst the proposed increase would result in a higher ridgeline than the adjacent bungalow, it would still remain significantly lower than the two-storey dwelling, thus resulting in a stepped approach between the two properties.

6. The proposed extension of the roof over the existing side extension of the property would result in an increased roof width overall. However, this element would be subservient in height to the main ridge and would therefore sit below the ridge height of the adjacent bungalow. Although the set down from the proposed main ridge would not meet the requirements of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area Design Guide (2018) (Design Guide), the proposed subservient ridge height of the side element would serve to mitigate the overall bulk of the roof and would not therefore be harmful to the visual character of the area.

7. Overall, the roof would appear noticeably larger than the existing as a result of the proposed alterations, however I have had regard to the approved scheme which would already see an increase in the height of the roof. The proposed additional increase would not be so significant to result in adverse impacts over and above the approved scheme.

8. In addition, several of the bungalows along Meadway are large properties with varied roof designs and I therefore find that the proposed alterations would not appear bulky or dominant to a degree that would appear incongruous with, or harmful to, the surroundings.

9. The Design Guide indicates that front roof lights are not be supported. I have had regard to this guidance, however there are numerous examples of properties with front roof lights along Meadway and in proximity to the appeal site. Whilst I do not know the full circumstances behind these examples, they nevertheless establish the presence of front rooflights within the surroundings and accordingly this element of the proposal would not appear incongruous or be detrimental to the surroundings.

10. Consequently, whilst the development does not comply wholly with the provisions of the adopted Design Guide, for the above reasons I find that it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the surroundings and would therefore preserve the character or appearance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.

[1] Application Reference 2340/18 and Appeal Reference APP/W5780/D/19/3219672
[2] Application Reference 0947/18

11. The proposal therefore accords with Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (2018). Collectively, these seek to ensure that development achieves a high quality design, respects the local character of the area and the host building, preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and is well integrated and has regard to the surrounding area, amongst other things.

Other Matters

12. Local objections were received in relation to the planning application submitted to the Council concerning, in addition to the above matters, loss of light, privacy and overlooking. Whilst the proposed alterations above the existing side extension would be closer to the side elevation of No 8 than the approved alterations, this would not encroach beyond the existing side wall. The proposed oriel window, although closer under the appeal scheme, would replicate that previously approved. In addition, there are existing ground floor windows in the side elevation at present. From the orientation of the buildings and the size of the adjoining plots, overshadowing, overlooking and loss of light are unlikely to result in undue harm to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition listing the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the materials to match the existing dwelling is necessary in the interest of preserving the visual character of the property and Conservation Area. The Council have requested no additional conditions and I consider none to be necessary.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR