



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2021

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3254232

40A Balfour Road, Ilford IG1 4JG

- 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 U Bhattibi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1125/20, dated 14 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Unlike the majority of properties along Balfour Road, the appeal property is a detached, rather than semi-detached, dwelling. It does, however, share a number of similarities such that it appears very much typical of the street's prevailing character. Thus, the distinctive chamfered two-storey bay dominates the property's front elevation, it is set behind a modest paved forecourt area and views of the flank elevation's double gable peaks and double dual-pitched roofs are visible between properties, the eastern flank elevation and its roofline more so due to the alignment of Balfour Road and the staggered layout of neighbouring houses.
4. The proposed loft conversion and rear dormer extension would substantially alter the appeal property's roofline. Although No. 40/40A's front roof plane and visible ridge level would remain unaltered, the proposal extension would be akin to a mansard roof. The central valley and roof slopes would be replaced by a large expanse of flat roof, the rise and fall of the double peaks replaced by the additional bulk of an extended flank elevation, and the rear dormer, with its minimal differentiation in terms of inset and set down would add further to the resulting mass and bulk at roof level.
5. It is fair to say that the not all of these manifestations would be widely visible. They would, however, be evident to varying degrees from various aspects and viewpoints. Moreover, given the increasing stagger and set back between Nos 40 (40 and 40A) and 38, the alterations to the roofline would be clearly visible

above the sloping hipped roof of No. 38, where it would appear cumbersome and incongruously bulky.

6. Although the parties disagree as to whether the appeal property's existing roof design is consistent with the typical form of a London butterfly roof, it is nevertheless typical of roof forms for properties along Balfour Road. The appellant understates the extent to which the proposed roof form would be visible from Balfour Road and, as a consequence, underestimates the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property, and also on the surrounding area.
7. Views of the rear dormer may be more limited, restricted by the layout of other buildings to views from the rears of those surrounding buildings, but that does not diminish its impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The absence of meaningful insets from the side of the roof, set-down from the ridge and setback from the rear façade result in a dominant and top-heavy extension to the property and which, when combined with the additional bulk and mass to the building's flank elevations, would also result in an incongruous and uncharacteristic roof form.
8. Taking these factors together, the proposed loft conversion and rear dormer extension would fail to respect local character, form and layout and would fail to complement the character of the building in terms of its scale, style, form or roof profile. As such, the proposal is contrary to Redbridge Local Plan policies LP26 and LP30 which together seek to secure high quality design in all development within the borough.

Other Matters

9. The appellant argues an inconsistency in the scope of permitted development rights and the restriction of their application to flats, citing as an example that a dormer window could be built under such rights at the appeal property had it not been sub-divided to flats. That may be so, but it is a hypothetical situation in relation to the appeal property and is not a material consideration to which I give any significant weight.
10. Nor do I give an appeal example, cited by the appellant, for a proposal incorporating a dormer window in a neighbouring borough¹, any significant weight as I have only been supplied with the appeal decision and no other details. I cannot therefore be certain that it is usefully or directly comparable and the weight it carries in support of the proposal is therefore limited.
11. I have noted that there were no objections to the proposal from occupiers of neighbouring property. However, this is a neutral matter which weighs neither in support of, or against, the proposal.

Conclusion

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

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/G5750/D/17/3168144