
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2022

by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3281215

50 The Drive, South Woodford, London E18 2BJ

- 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 Dr R. K Gupta against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1930/21, dated 5 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a proposed new side dormer extension to detached house in a Conservation Area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side dormer extension at 50 The Drive, South Woodford, London E18 2BJ in accordance with the terms of application Ref 1930/21, dated 5 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 826-200-L-102 – Proposed First Floor Plan; 826-200-L-X05 – Proposed Front Elevation; 826-200-L-R02 – Proposed Roof Plan; 826-200-L-003 – Block Plan; 826-000-L-002 – Existing plans and elevations; 826-000-L-003 – Site Location Plan; 826-200-L-002 – Proposed Ground Floor Plan; 826-200-L-X06 – Proposed Side Elevation A; 826-200-L-X07 – Proposed Side Elevation B; 826-200-L-X08 – Proposed Rear Elevation.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of the proposed development from that contained on the application form to 'side dormer extension'. This is a more succinct description of the proposed development which I have therefore used in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Snaresbrook Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a detached dwelling with a distinctive and prominent front gable and having a turret feature at the northern front corner of a large, hipped roof with first floor accommodation partly in the roof space. The hipped roof extends the full height of the first floor level on the northern elevation. It is located within the Snaresbrook Conservation Area and sited on a relatively long and straight street comprising a series of relatively large, detached dwellings of various styles and sizes, many of which appear to have been significantly extended.
5. The proposed development would involve the construction of a first floor side box dormer in the northern roof slope which the Council indicate would be set approximately 1.25m above the eaves, 2.99m below the ridge line and 0.65 – 0.7m away from the edges of the side roof slope. In being placed away from the eaves and flank, set down from the ridge and being of modest size, I do not consider the proposed dormer itself to be a particularly prominent or unusually discordant feature in the roof slope. However, the Council considers that, as the proposed dormer would be set behind the turret, it would appear at odds with this existing architectural element and would block the gap between the pitch of the roof and the turret.
6. The adjacent property at No 48 is of similar appearance and scale to the appeal property and also has a turret at the northern front corner of a large, hipped roof at first floor level. This property has a dormer in a similar position and size to that proposed at the appeal property. I recognise that this may have been granted planning permission before the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Local Plan were introduced. Nonetheless, it provides a visual reference to assist in the consideration of the effect of a dormer on the character and appearance of both the property and the Conservation Area as a whole.
7. Owing to the relatively small-scale nature of the proposed dormer, its position on the roof slope and the set back away from the turret, I do not consider that it would appear at odds with the character and appearance of the appeal property, or that of the properties in the surrounding area. Whilst in views of the appeal property frontage, a small triangle of the dormer cheek would be visible between the turret and the roof slope, the turret would continue to appear as the dominant visual element in the street scene. The proposed dormer would appear as a distinguishable and subservient feature that would retain a gap between the dormer cheek and the turret.
8. Views of the proposed dormer would not be readily attainable from the south of the appeal property. From the north, views would be seen in the context of the substantial mass of the adjacent property at No 52, located close to the boundary with the appeal property. This would limit such views to those being obtainable only in relatively close proximity of the appeal property and would be of an oblique nature. Given the locational and design factors in this case, in views of the frontage of the property from the road, I consider that the appearance of the dwelling within the street scene would be largely unchanged.

9. Taking the above factors into account, I conclude that the proposal would not have a significant detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host property and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as a whole in accordance with section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It would also accord with paragraph 197 of the Framework.
10. As a result, there would be no conflict with Policies LP26 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 nor with Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021. These policies, amongst other things, require development to make a positive architectural and urban design contribution and that development in Conservation Areas preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the area.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider it necessary to impose a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interests of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have imposed a condition concerning the external materials to be used.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, taking into account the development plan as a whole based on the evidence before me and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR