



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 October 2021

by R Walmsley BSc, MSc, MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3280833

19 Whitehall Lane, Buckhurst Hill IG9 5JH

- 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 Denise Munday against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1979/21, dated 6 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is proposed loft conversion with rear dormer. Raise height of roof. Three front rooflights. Alterations to fenestrations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the Council's decision notice as this more accurately describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Policy LP26 of the Local Plan (2018) (LP) seeks development that, amongst other things, respects the local character of the area and makes a positive architectural contribution to its context and location. Policy LP30 of the LP and the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (SPD) refer more specifically to house extensions. The latter emphasises the importance of dormer windows being subordinate in size to the roof of the house.
5. The dormer would extend across a significant proportion of the rear roof slope, both horizontally and vertically and as a result would appear unduly dominant in relation to the form and scale of the roof. The low solid to void ratio of tile to glazed window would accentuate the dormer's overly dominant form. In addition, the development would appear awkwardly juxtaposed to the existing rear roof slope. Altogether the dormer would be out of keeping with the form and scale of the host property and therefore would be an unsympathetic and harmful addition.

6. There are equally large dormers in the area surrounding the appeal site. I have no evidence of the Council granting permission for these developments and therefore considering them acceptable. I have insufficient evidence before me to comment in detail on each proposal, albeit it is not within the remit of this appeal for me to assess the suitability of other development proposals. Nonetheless, on first impressions the dormers appear equally incongruous with a marked and harmful effect on the visual quality and character of the surrounding area. And so, the examples cited do not set a precedent in favour of the appeal.
7. Whilst the properties either side of the appeal site have different roof forms, their ridge heights are not dissimilar. The increased ridge height proposed and the steeper roof profile would result in the appeal property appearing unduly dominant alongside the properties on the same side of the street and either side of the appeal site.
8. And so, for the reasons given, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the LP and the SPD.

Other matters

9. It is not within the remit of this appeal to comment on the events that led the Council to its decision. Any grievances the appellant has in this regard should be directed to the Council.
10. I appreciate the appellant's need to accommodate office space within the existing property. However, it is not clear why the existing property cannot accommodate sufficient office space or indeed why the additional space proposed is required for three people. The matter of need, therefore, does not weigh in favour of the appeal.
11. The lack of objection raised by third parties does not outweigh the harm arising to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR