



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2021

by Mr Kim Bennett BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3252239

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 0742/20, dated 5 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is the enlargement of the existing roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow located on the western side of Meadway. The original bungalow was modest in nature with an interesting roof form and a hipped projection forward of the main front elevation. However, it has been extensively extended with flat roofed extensions to either side and to the rear. There are further bungalows to the south on either side of the road, many of which have attractive pitched roof dormers to the front and rear. The character changes to the north of the property with a greater variety in architectural style, including the adjacent property to the north which is a two storey gable fronted building. The site lies within Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.
4. The property has been the subject of a number of recent applications. In 2018 permission was granted for the alteration of the roof from a hip to a gable on both sides¹. This was followed in 2019 by an enlargement to the roof which was granted permission on appeal² and comprised an increase on the previous scheme with a higher roof height, gable ends and a flat roofed section at ridge level. Subsequently in 2020, permission was also granted on appeal for a proposal which would involve an increase in ridge height of 0.5 metres over the

¹ Application reference 0947/18.

² Appeal reference APP/W5780/D/19/3219672

previously approved scheme and therefore increased roof width overall³ (the 2020 permission). Both Inspectors came to the conclusion that there are a variety of roof designs along Meadway and therefore the proposed alterations would not appear out of character with the surroundings. None of the permissions have yet been implemented but all are capable of being so and therefore are important considerations to the current proposal.

5. Because of the Conservation Area location, in assessing the current scheme I have also given particular attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
6. The proposal looks to alter the previous permissions in 3 distinct ways and I will deal with each in turn.
7. At the rear, the 2020 permission proposed 3 pitched roof dormers and it is currently proposed to alter these to one continuous flat roof dormer extending some 10 metres in width. A particular characteristic of roof forms in the vicinity is that of small pitched roof dormers on both front and rear elevations. These add significant character and interest to the appearance of the properties within the Conservation Area. In order to guide development and assist in preserving the character of the area, the Council has adopted the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area Design Guide 2018 (DG). In respect of dormers, the guidance is to limit the numbers of dormers in both size and extent, and to feature pitched roofs to replicate the form of historic features of the main property. Although it is guidance and therefore cannot be prescriptive, I consider that the objectives are based on sound design principles.
8. In contrast to the guidance, the proposed single rear dormer, spanning most of the rear roof area would appear box like and totally at odds with the character of prevailing dormers within the area and indeed those granted permission on the previous schemes. Although located at the rear, they would still be visible from other properties and in my view would cause visual harm as a result.
9. Although I have been referred to other examples of flat roofed dormers, including those nearby on number 10 Meadway, they are not as large as that currently proposed, and in any event only demonstrate how inappropriate such a flat roofed dormer is to the character and appearance of these bungalow properties. In that context, they are not a good reason to allow a larger dormer which would cause further harm.
10. The second revision proposes an alteration to the approved roof form on the northern elevation which would introduce a further section of pitched roof above a section of existing flat roof. Although it would incorporate an oriel window which is a feature of the previous permission, it would result in a most awkward architectural detail with a small element of flat roof to the front and side and would be in close proximity to the adjoining property No 4A Meadway. The infilling of the majority of the space between both properties at ground and first floor would give a cramped appearance as a result. I am less concerned about the reduced setback of 0.4 metres compared to the recommended 1 metre in the DG, bearing in mind the overall changes to the bungalow that have already been approved. However, I consider a combination of the other concerns, which would be clearly visible from the road, would cause visual harm.

³ Appeal reference APP/w5780/D/19/3238755

11. The third revision proposes a marginal increase to the front part of the approved roof area on the southern elevation so that the pitch of that section of roof would now be continuous with the main roof. In that respect, the Council is also concerned about the lack of setback of 1 metre as recommended in the DG. I agree with that view in that the roof form from the front elevation would be continuous for its greater part and would appear unbalanced as a result, with the extended roof on the southern side failing to read as a subordinate element to the main roof. In that respect it would also cause visual harm.

Other matters

12. Concerns have been raised by the occupiers of the neighbouring property No 4A Meadway in terms of the impact arising from the proposed changes to the northern elevation. The Council considers that because of the staggered relationship between the two properties and the fact that the adjoining window in No 4A is a landing window, the relationship would be acceptable. Having considered that matter at my site visit and in the context of the permissions already granted, I see no reason to disagree.
13. In addition to No 10 Meadway, I took the opportunity to view the other examples of alterations to nearby properties which the appellant has drawn my attention to. However, either they raised different design considerations, or were not examples which justify being regarded as suitable precedents to follow. In any event, I have reached my findings above based on the site circumstances and design considerations of this particular proposal.

Conclusions

14. Having regard to the above, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, even having regard to the extent of changes to the existing dwelling already approved. Although the character of the Conservation Area and particularly its roof forms is somewhat mixed, the proposed further changes would also cause visual harm for the reasons set out. For all these reasons, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Council's Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) and guidance within the DG in that it would not be of a high quality design, would not respect the character of the host building and the area, and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.
15. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Kim Bennett

INSPECTOR