

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2022

**by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 25<sup>TH</sup> April 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3292027**  
**186 Roding Lane South, ILFORD, IG4 5PP**

- 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 Jamal Rana against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref. 4065/21, dated 26 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2021.
  - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, loft conversion, conversion of hip roof to a gable end roof and garage conversion into a habitable room.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. In Part E of the appeal form a different wording has been entered, but as the parties have not provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed I have used the one given in the original application.
3. The parties have described the appeal development as retrospective. However, at the appeal site visit there appeared to be differences between the development as built and that shown on the submitted plans. For example, two rather than three front rooflights have been installed; the rear dormer window appears to be closer to the roof ridge, and/or with a larger gap above the flank window; and differences around the front of the garage conversion/side extension in relation to the front bay. For the avoidance of doubt, I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the development 'as proposed' on the submitted plans, rather than assessing the development as built.

## Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appeal property, the semi-detached pair of which it forms part and the wider street scene.

## Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located in a mixed residential street scene of two-storey and single-storey dwellings, many of which have converted the roof space to provide additional accommodation. There are

various examples of mixed roof forms on semi-detached pairs, including those where one half has a hipped roof and the other a gable end. The symmetry to the appeal property and attached dwelling would appear to have been diminished by their garage designs. In this context, whilst the proposed hip-to-gable roof extension would create some imbalance to the semi-detached pair, given the array of building styles in the area I do not find that it would adversely affect the visual amenities and character of the locality.

6. Policy LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (LP) supports extensions which complement the character of the building, particularly in terms of scale, style, form and materials, and which maintains or improves the appearance of the locality or street scene. The policy is supported by the Council's adopted Housing Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD), which requires roof alterations to be subordinate in size to the roof of the house and to not appear as a dominant feature. To achieve this, the SPD recommends that rear dormers should be sited at least 0.5m below the ridge of the roof, 1m above the eaves and set in 1m from the shared boundary and from the edge of the roof (0.5m from the edge for hipped roofs).
7. The appellant confirms that the dormer window would occupy the full width of the original building, with its flank walls being 150mm from the shared boundary, and the other positioned on the original wall plate of the dwelling; and set 300mm above the eaves. With this spacing around the dormer, it would result in an overly large addition that would occupy most of the rear roof slope. It would appear unduly dominant on the dwelling, and the southern side elevation would be highly visible in the street scene as a result of the position of the dwelling on a bend in the road. The lack of a side inset from the southern edge of the roof would create a bulky and discordant elevation.
8. Within the local area there are clearly examples of large, box-style dormer windows without the spacing sought by the SPD, including additions without insets to the roof sides. However, whilst the appellant has drawn attention to other examples, few planning permissions for these have been identified, and no plans or details supplied for comparison with the proposal. On the basis of the limited information before me I cannot gauge their relevance to the proposal: for example, it is not known whether or not they required, or have been built in accordance with, planning permission, nor if they were assessed against the same planning policies now in place. Although some full-width dormer windows may form part of the local context, they are not the prevailing style. The more successfully integrated dormer examples in the area are inset from the surrounding roof eaves and appear more subordinate to the roof slopes in which they are set than proposed in this case.
9. I acknowledge that the development would not materially harm the amenities enjoyed by neighbouring residents, but that does not override the visual aspects of the proposal.
10. The improved energy efficiency of the dwelling would be a benefit, but this could be secured without the need for a rear dormer window of the size proposed, and as such this factor has only limited weight.
11. I note the appellant's reference to large box dormers being allowed as Permitted Development (PD). However, there is no suggestion that the cumulative extent of the roof alterations proposed would be PD, and therefore

a 'fallback' development that would not require express planning permission would likely have less visual impact on the dwelling and the street scene.

12. The proposal includes single-storey side and rear extensions. The Council raises no objection to these aspects of the proposal, and given the relationship with neighbouring properties I have no reason to disagree. The appellant asks that these elements be granted planning permission if the dormer aspect of the appeal is unsuccessful. However, the roofs to the ground floor rear and side extensions are interlinked, with the latter also linked to the hip-to-gable roof changes. On that basis, I am not satisfied that the ground floor extensions are severable from the roof extensions, and both physically and functionally independent. As such, I am unable to issue a split decision.
13. I therefore conclude that, as a result of its size, design and siting, the proposed rear dormer window would adversely affect the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene, contrary to the design aims of LP Policy LP30, as supported by the SPD, and LP Policy LP26, which amongst other criteria seeks to promote high quality design which respects the local character and makes a positive architectural and urban design contribution to its context and location.

### **Other Matters**

14. The grounds of appeal refer to the inclusion of permeable garden parking. However, this was not included in the description of development on the planning application form, nor identified on the submitted plans. As such, I have not taken this into account in my assessment.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the above reasons, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

*H Lock*

INSPECTOR