



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3360961

14 Aragon Drive, Hainault, Ilford, IG6 2TS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ruhul Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 2882/24.
 - The development is described as “retention of two front dormer roof extensions”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property, the street scene and the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house prominently located at the junction of Aragon Drive and Anne Way, and opposite Colvin Gardens. Although there is some more modern housing in the wider area, dwellings of similar period and design to the appeal property are prevalent in the vicinity. There are many examples of loft conversions with rear dormer windows and front rooflights, but front dormer windows are not characteristic of the area.
4. The dormer windows the subject of this appeal have been constructed and are highly visible on the property and in the street scene. Rather than being simple, complementary and subsidiary to the dwelling, they appear cluttered on the front roof slope as a result of the proximity to the roof of an existing front wing; one of the dormer windows is cut around this projecting roof due to the lack of space. In addition, both dormers are poorly related to the window positions and styles below. Whilst the dark tiling and framing may match the rear dormer window, they are a stark contrast from the materials of the main dwelling. I note the appellant's view that architectural features of the dwelling are retained, but I consider that the dormer additions detract from the façade and the building.
5. The design aims of Policy 26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (LP) are supported by guidance in the 'Housing Design' Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD). This advises that front dormers are generally not considered to be appropriate unless they are an original or common feature of properties in that

street. In this case, the introduction of the dormer windows on the front roof slope undermines the original architectural style of the dwelling, and in so doing appears incongruous in the context of the simple front roof slopes of other dwellings in the vicinity. In this regard, I do not consider the street scene and townscape to be as mixed as suggested by the appellant, and do not share the view that the dormers seamlessly blend with the character and form prevalent in the locality. The established presence of rear dormer windows in the area would not set a precedent for such alterations to front roof slopes.

6. I accept that there is a requirement to optimise use of land, and the appellant advises that the development provides much needed residential accommodation. However, the appeal property already benefits from a rear dormer window, and the additional headroom facilitated by the front dormers would not justify the adverse visual impact on the property and street scene.
7. The property is not listed and is not located within a conservation area. Whilst such locations may be more sensitive to change, the principles of good design should apply in all areas, and not only those involving heritage assets.
8. The Design and Access Statement submitted with the planning application referred to a number of dormer extensions, but no planning permissions were identified, and as such it is not known if these developments were assessed against current planning policies and guidance. The Council's report indicates that the closest example in Colvin Gardens dates from the 1960s, and others are on different building styles and different contexts. As this type of development is the exception in the local street scene, the examples cited offer little support to the appeal.
9. I therefore conclude that the development detracts from the character and appearance of the appeal property, the street scene and the locality. It conflicts with LP Policy LP26, which amongst other criteria seeks high quality design which respects the local character of the area, and is well integrated and has regard to and respect for the surrounding area in terms including form, style, massing, materials and design. As noted above, it is also contrary to guidance in the SPD.
10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR