



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2021

**by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 23 September 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3259752**  
**1018 High Road, Romford RM6 4BA**

- 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 Lonergan against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
  - The application Ref 4857/19, dated 27 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2020.
  - The proposed development is for loft conversion with a rear dormer, two front roof lights and internal alterations.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is a maisonette apartment within a terrace of similar such maisonettes fronting onto High Road. The block appears purpose built and dates to around 1938. On the opposite side of Mansted Gardens there is a near identical block of maisonettes giving the streetscene here an element of symmetry and cohesion. I consider that the bow fronted bay windows, large, overhanging eaves, mix of brick and render and the long hipped roofs are characteristic features of the existing building as are the protruding 'outshots' and external stairs and balconies to the rear.
4. To the rear of the property the flats appear to be served by an informal dirt track that is used for parking of vehicles and also appears to give rear access to the building. The long hipped roofs of the rear outshot elements are particularly noticeable when viewed from Mansted Gardens and I consider that the identical nature of these roof features is important for the particular characteristics contained within the building and area.
5. Most houses behind the appeal site are terraced suburban type houses most with bay windows and Mock Tudor gables and rear gardens. These houses, together with the appeal block and the opposite block of maisonettes give this

area an element of character consistent with such mid twentieth century suburban development.

6. The proposal is to construct a flat roof dormer extension to the main roof of the maisonette block at the rear. This would enable the dormer to be set back from the projecting outshots of the building. Despite this, the dormer would still appear to be close to the existing eaves line with only a modest set back in order to accommodate the structure into the roof. Similarly, the roof of the dormer would also be only relatively marginally set down from the ridge of the existing roof and as such would appear as a relatively large structure.
7. Although I consider that the proposed dormer will not be very visible from the public realm, I do consider that its introduction would cause a level of harm to the largely intact architectural form of the building as a whole. This harm would be compounded by the large size and dominance of the dormer and the lack of sufficient set in from the eaves that I consider would cause the proposal to fail in its attempt to enhance the appearance of the building.
8. The appellant has directed my attention to several other extensions nearby and I saw on my site visit that there are some large dormer roof extensions to some of the properties along Mansted Gardens and surrounding streets. I also saw that work was being undertaken on the roof to a building opposite. I have no information before me however, as to the reasons or background to these developments and so I cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same as the case before me.
9. Nonetheless I do not consider that further such changes would enhance or complement the overriding characteristics of the area. I also consider it noticeable that there are no such large dormer extensions to the two flanking blocks of maisonettes that the appeal property belongs to and I consider this absence as significant.
10. Although I consider that there may be ways to extend into the roof of this property in such a way as to avoid or minimise harm, I consider that the proposals before me fail to meet the requirements contained within Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan and Local Plan policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan, both of which seek to ensure that extensions and new development are of a high quality standard of design.

## **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

*A Graham*

INSPECTOR