



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2021

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3271855

145 Hermon Hill, London E18 1QQ

- 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 Sundip Jangi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4109/20, dated 1 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with three dormers clad in zinc; skylights on the flat roof and the roof of the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the planning application was determined, the London Plan 2021 has been adopted, and Policy 7.4 from the London Plan 2016, which was referred to in the Council's decision, is now superceded. The principal parties were given an opportunity to comment on the adopted London Plan during the appeal, and I have considered the scheme against its policies.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019 ('SPD') sets out at section 3.6 that roof alterations should be subordinate in size to the host's roof and that they should not appear as a dominant feature. It states at paragraph 3.6.2 that rear dormers should be at least 0.5 metre below the ridge, set away from hipped roof edges by at least 0.5 metre, and up from the eaves by 1 metre.
5. The proposed rear dormer serving the bedroom would have deeply inset sliding doors. It would be set slightly down from the ridge and up from the eaves, but by less than the SPD's recommended distances. It would be of a substantial size, and would be attached to the proposed bathroom dormer, which would cut across the hipped roofs between the original property and its set down extension. The host property's resultant roof form would be very awkward and complex.

6. Additionally, as the bathroom dormer would not be set down from the extension's roof, and given their combined scale and bulk, these two dormers would dominate the host property's roof.
7. The scheme would thus give the property a very top-heavy appearance, whose harmful impact would be very apparent on this prominent corner plot. In particular, given the slight curvature in the road, these dormers would be highly visible, dominant and incongruous features when approaching along Charnwood Drive from the south-east, and they would jar with the generally much more restrained and simpler roof forms in that streetscene.
8. The proposed dormer serving the office space would be much smaller, and would thus have a more limited visual impact. However, combined with the rear facing dormers it adds to the scheme's complexity. Whilst contrasting materials can help distinguish extensions from the original building, and therefore allow a property's history and evolution to be understood, in this case the use of zinc would further draw-the-eye, and would thereby exacerbate the harm that I have found.
9. Although there are many rear dormers on nearby properties, those at 141, 163 and 183 Hermon Hill are not on corner plots, and none that I observed are cumulatively so complex and so prominent as these would be. I have no details, such as the location and context, of the other photographic examples of buildings with differing roofs in the appellant's statement.
10. Whilst the proposal seeks to optimise the potential of the site, and to make an effective use of the land, as it would not safeguard or improve the environment, it does not benefit from the stance at paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Additionally, given my findings above, and as the scheme does not represent appropriate innovation or change, it does not benefit from the Framework's support for good design.
11. As a consequence of its inset doors and perforated metal panel, the outlook from the bedroom dormer would be predominantly down the host property's own garden; and the side dormer would look principally over the road. The scheme would not therefore give rise to a significant loss of privacy for nearby occupiers.
12. In general terms, Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (2018) ('RLP') Policy LP26, and Policies D1 and D3 of the London Plan 2021 require development, and development plan policies, to promote high quality design, which respects the host building and makes a positive contribution to its context and to local character. RLP Policy LP30 requires extensions to be subordinate to the existing building, and to have a sympathetic roof profile and materials. For the above reasons, the scheme would conflict with those policies, and with the SPD.
13. The scheme would conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR