



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2021

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3265647

49 Hathaway Gardens, Chadwell Heath, Romford RM6 5TL

- 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 Fazal Habib against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3479/20, dated 20 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a first floor with front bay window; single storey front extension with front porch; loft conversion with one rear and two side dormers; two roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on (a) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, Nos. 103, 105 and 107 Havering Gardens.

Reasons

3. The dwelling on the appeal site, formerly a bungalow, is currently undergoing extension, refurbishment and alteration, pursuant to an earlier planning permission. It is located along a residential road characterised predominantly by two storey properties though the road opposite to the immediate south of the site is characterised by bungalows.
4. The proposal involves extensive changes to the original property to change it from a single to a two-storey property with further accommodation in the roofspace. However, on the basis of the information provided, it is clear that it the Council's objections focus solely on the proposed roof dormers to the rear and side of the new proposed roofslopes.

Character and appearance

5. This issue relates only to the proposed side dormers. The Council's adopted Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD) provides detailed guidance on how the Council's policies in the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (LP) are to be applied. The section on extensions and alterations states that it sets out the type of domestic development that may be acceptable and each development will be considered on its merits on the basis that each property is different. Specific guidance on roof extensions is provided in section 3.6. This states in the text that "*front and side dormers are generally*

not considered to be appropriate, unless they are an original or common feature of properties in that street". Supporting figure 12 shows examples of rear and side dormers and states that such dormers that are in proportion and in keeping with the design of the house will be considered favourably. In my view, this figure is to be read in the context of the supporting text, that is, in the case of side dormers, such designs will be considered favourably where they are a common feature of properties in that street.

6. In light of the above guidance, it is the case that side dormers are not a common feature of Hathaway Gardens, the street in which the appeal site is located. The majority of properties, and all of those within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, retain their original hipped roof forms and these provide a distinctive feature in the streetscene. Whilst I acknowledge that the roof areas of a number of nearby properties, including some which immediately adjoin the appeal site to the north along Havering Gardens, have been altered and extended with large rear box dormers, and these are clearly visible from Hathaway Gardens, there are no side dormers visible within this context.
7. I therefore consider that the proposed side dormers would be out of character and despite their reasonably modest overall size, would be inappropriate features that would disrupt the prevailing hipped roof forms within the street scene and thereby fail to integrate with the established character.
8. I find that the proposed side dormers would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene. As a result, the proposal would fail to accord with LP Policies LP26 and LP30 which seek high quality design that respects local character and is well integrated with the local area and, in respect of household extensions, complements the character of and is subordinate to and incorporates a roof profile and materials sympathetic to the existing dwelling.
9. The proposal would also fail to satisfy guidance in the SPD for the reasons set out above.

Living conditions

10. This issue relates only to the proposed rear dormer. The rear gardens of all the properties adjoining the appeal site are relatively modest and the proximity of dwellings means that there is already a degree of mutual overlooking from first floor windows between these properties. This would be the case with the proposal which includes first floor rear windows.
11. However, the proposed rear dormer would be at a higher level, resulting in the potential for an increased level of overlooking. Furthermore, the rear garden of the appeal property is noticeably smaller than others it adjoins, being and very short depth, and the new dormer window would face towards no. 103 Havering Gardens which lies immediately to the rear and adjoins the boundary of the appeal site.
12. The appellant refers to the relationship between first floor windows of these adjoining properties in respect of which there is no objection from the Council. However, it seems to me that whilst similar distances would be maintained in respect of the dormer, its' elevated position coupled with proximity to these adjoining properties would result in an increased level of overlooking.

13. The existing roof dormers at the adjoining properties, which appear to have been installed under permitted development rights, afford only an oblique angle of view and over a greater depth of rear garden.
14. I therefore find that the proposed rear dormer would also fail to accord with LP Policies 26 and 30 which seek high quality development that respects the privacy of surrounding residents and does not result in a serious cumulative impact on the environmental quality of the area.
15. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraph 127, which seeks to ensure that development adds to the overall quality of the area, is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and the built environment generally.

Conclusions

16. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR