



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2025

**By SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 June 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3363043**

**23 Monkams Drive, Woodford Green IG8 0LG**

- 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 Jason Rush against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref is 3432/24
  - The development proposed is described as “pitched roof front dormer”.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a pitched roof front dormer at 23 Monkams Drive, Woodford Green IG8 0LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Reference 3432/24 and the plans submitted with it, 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: ST\_NOV 24\_23 MON\_001, ST\_NOV 24\_23 MON\_002, ST\_NOV 24\_23 MON\_003, ST\_NOV 24\_23 MON\_LP, Site Plan, Fire Safety Report.
  - 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. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Woodford Broadway Conservation Area (CA).

### Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling located in a predominantly residential area characterised by wide attractive streets, which are lined with large semi-detached or detached properties set back from the road frontage and of a similar style.
4. The appeal site is also located in the CA. The terms of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require me to pay special

- attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
5. The Woodford Broadway Conservation Area Appraisal (2013) ('CAA') sets out that the unique character of the CA largely derives from its development as a prestigious Edwardian and inter-war estate for the middle-classes. The CAA indicates that the residential properties are large detached and semi-detached properties, many of which have been individually detailed or form small clusters with rich Edwardian decorative features. It highlights, amongst other features, that turrets are an example of the decorative detailing within the area.
  6. As such, I find the significance of the CA, insofar as is relevant to this case to be associated with the cohesive and well-preserved historic buildings, their detailing and their relationship with the street. The area thereby has both architectural and historic interest.
  7. The Council's Housing Design Guide SPD (2019) states that front and side dormers are generally not considered to be appropriate, unless they are an original or common feature of properties in that street.
  8. The appeal property represents a well-preserved example of a large Edwardian dwelling, contributing positively to the character and appearance of the CA. It has a reasonably strong symmetry with the attached dwelling, 25 Monkams Drive (No. 25), with both dwellings sharing several distinctive features including projecting gables, roof turrets and front facing dormers. The presence of front dormers is a recurring characteristic within the street scene and several properties with comparably scaled plot frontages feature two front dormers.
  9. The proposed front dormer would replace an existing roof light and would generally reflect the proportions, detailing and alignment of the existing front dormer. It would be positioned behind the plane of the existing projecting gable and turret features, set above the eaves line and spaced away from the existing dormer. These aspects, in conjunction with its traditional form and the use of matching materials, would ensure that the proposed dormer would appear subordinate and sensitively integrated in the roofscape. Importantly, the form and visual integrity of the main roof and turret feature would remain clearly discernible, preserving the architectural coherence of the front elevation and ensuring that there would be relative consistency maintained in the appearance of the elevation when contrasted with that of the attached No.25.
  10. The set-back position of the appeal dwelling within the plot, combined with the presence of the dominant architectural elements of the projecting gable and turret, reduce the visual prominence of the proposed dormer in public views. In oblique views along Monkams Drive, the dormer would be perceived as a contextual architectural detail, consistent with other individual decorative elements that contribute to the character of the area. Furthermore, during the summer months, existing mature tree coverage would provide additional screening, further diminishing any potential visual impact.
  11. Overall, I therefore find that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. It would also preserve the character, appearance and significance of the CA as whole. As such, the proposal would not conflict with Policies HC1 and D3 of the London Plan (2021) or Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030

(2018), which amongst other things, seek to protect heritage assets and deliver high quality design that protects the character of existing buildings.

### **Conditions**

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests of paragraph 57 of the Framework and advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the statutory time limit condition, I agree that a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary to provide certainty. A condition relating to materials is also reasonable and necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above, having taken account of the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, the appeal should therefore be allowed.

*SJ Desai*

INSPECTOR