
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 11 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/19/3230495

239a Eastern Avenue, Ilford IG4 5AS

- 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 Imran Kaiser against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1311/19, dated 18 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant describes amendments made to the proposals in response to the Council's reason for refusal. However, it is clear from the appellant's submissions that these amendments were submitted after the Council had determined the application and that the Council had not, as a consequence, had the opportunity to formally consider the amendments.
3. The 'Planning Appeals: Procedural Guide' is quite clear regarding the submission of revised plans and proposals during the course of the appeal process¹. Neither the Council nor, importantly neighbours, have had the opportunity to consider the amended plans. As such, I have to determine the proposal as it was determined by the Council and I have not considered the appellant's amended plans in reaching my conclusions.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terraced property located towards the end of a short terraced block close to the junction of Eastern Avenue with Danehurst Gardens. Common along the rear of the terrace are two storey rear outriggers, paired with the adjacent property. The rear of the appeal property is clearly visible from Danehurst Gardens above and across the intervening rear garden of 241 Eastern Avenue.

¹ Annexe M.2.1

6. The proposed dormer window would be a bulky L-shaped box-dormer which would occupy almost all of the main house roof and that above the flat-roofed two storey outrigger. Although set in from the sides, and rear faces, of the main house and outrigger, those set-ins would be minimal. But at least they would be set in, unlike the dormer's roof, which instead would tie in with the existing ridge level of the house.
7. However, taken together the proposal's design would do little to minimise or mask the incongruous bulk and scale of the dormer which would be a dominant and disruptive feature atop No. 239a. It would also be equally so in respect of the rear of the terrace as a whole. I acknowledge that there are other dormer windows present within this, and nearby, terraced blocks, but the position of the proposed extension, and the appeal property itself, relative to Danehurst Gardens is such that the rear of the appeal property is both visible and prominent from street level, and significantly more so than other nearby examples.
8. Redbridge Local Plan (RLP) policy LP26 seeks to promote high quality design. To do this, proposals should, amongst other things, respect local character of the area and have regard to and respect for the surrounding area in terms of form, massing and design. RLP policy LP30, in relation to household extensions, will support householder development that complements the character of the building in terms of its scale, style and form; is subordinate to the existing building in its size, scale or height and maintains or improves the appearance of the locality or streetscene.
9. The proposal fails in these respects. For the reasons I have set out, the scale, position, size and appearance of the proposed dormer extension would dominate the rear elevation of the host building and fail to be subservient to it. It would be an incongruous, dominating, disruptive and intrusive addition to the rear of the property, and to the rear of this terraced block and would thus fail to achieve the Council's aims of encouraging high quality, respectful design or forms of extension. The proposal is therefore contrary to RLP policies LP26 and LP30, and the Council's guidance in respect of such matters, as set out in the 'Householder Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR