

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2024

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/23/3335103

63 Leyswood Drive, Newbury Park, Redbridge, Ilford, IG2 7JL

- 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 Mrs S Munayem against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2340/23, dated 1 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with side/rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with side/rear dormers at 63 Leyswood Drive, Newbury Park, Redbridge, Ilford, IG2 7JL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2340/23, dated 1 August 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: A23-07-L1a
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed loft conversion with side/rear dormers on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Leyswood Drive.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling comprises a semi-detached house in a street of similar aged mainly semi-detached and short terraced dwellings. It has a prominent front gable with front porch. The attached neighbour has a different design that is orientated through 90 degrees such that the gable with front porch faces towards Southdown Crescent. This arrangement is characteristic of many of the
-

corner locations nearby. On the opposite side of the street there is a terrace with large gable projections at either end, facing Leyswood Drive.

4. The proposed loft extension comprises dormers to each side roof slope of the projecting front gable and a rear dormer. The Council does not object to the rear dormer which would be similar to the rear dormer on the attached dwelling. I agree it would be acceptable. The side dormers would be visible in the street scene both from the front and when looking up or down the street and would alter the appearance of the dwelling. Nevertheless, they would be set back from the front gable such that this feature would be preserved. They would also be set up from the eaves and would not project above the main ridge.
5. There are a number of other large dormers visible in the street scene of Leyswood terrace, including within close proximity of the appeal site. In particular, similar dormers are seen at No 92, where they are side-on to the street in a similar orientation to the appeal site, and at No 71 which is on a corner plot a short distance from the appeal site. In this latter case one dormer faces onto Leyswood Drive and is particularly prominent in the street scene whilst the other is on the opposite elevation but clearly visible owing to the corner location of the dwelling. Further from the appeal site but within Leyswood Drive there are a number of other similar twin dormers on similar dwellings such that this type of development has become characteristic in the street, including in the vicinity of the appeal dwelling. The proposed dormers, although large and clearly visible, would therefore not be out of place, having a similar effect on the host dwelling and the street scene as other existing dormers nearby.
6. The Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), 2019, advises that dormers should be subordinate in size to the roof of the dwelling and sets out standoffs from the ridge, eaves and shared boundaries. The proposed dormers would not comply with these guidelines. Nevertheless, it appears from the evidence that at least some of the similar dormers in Leyswood Drive have been allowed as permitted development. I have no evidence to suggest that the proposed dormers or very similar dormers would not be permitted development and this is a material consideration. Moreover, although the guidelines suggests that side dormers are generally not considered to be appropriate, an exception is when they are a common feature of properties in the street which would apply in this case. I therefore find that material considerations indicate that deviations from the SPD standards would be justified.
7. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed loft conversion with side/rear dormers would have no materially detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene of Leyswood Drive. In consequence, it would comply with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030, 2018. Taken together and amongst other things these expect household extensions: to be of a good design that respects the local character of the area, including existing patterns of development; be well integrated in terms of form, style, massing, orientation and design; and maintain the appearance of the locality or street scene.

8. The Council suggests two conditions in addition to the statutory commencement condition. I agree that the development should be carried out in conformity with the approved plans and that external materials should match those used in the existing building. This is for the avoidance of doubt and to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR