



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2019

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3221565

3 The Avenue, Wanstead, London E11 2EE

- 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 Manjit Sidhu against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 4056/18, dated 3 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is a Single storey rear extension, loft conversion to accommodate habitable space: two bedrooms and en-suites, internal alterations, changing the finishing materials on elevations. Accommodation of habitable space in the loft will require installation of a new roof structure. The existing roof will be removed. The ridge level of the new roof will be 700mm higher than the existing ridge; eaves level will stay as existing. There will be two dormers installed on the rear roof pitch. The existing pitched roof to the rear elevation will be removed and replaced with a flat roof. There will be two centrally positioned rooflights, one to the front and one to the rear. The front rooflight will be of a conservation style.
-

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. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wanstead Grove Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).
 - The effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 5 The Avenue (No. 5) by way of visual impact and loss of outlook.

Reasons

Conservation Area

4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out how planning authorities should seek the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment and establishes that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning.
5. 3 The Avenue (No 3) is located within an area characterised by large predominantly detached late Victorian and Edwardian Houses built on an earlier historic designed landscape. The rich variety of architectural design, materials and detailing of the houses contributes to its significance.
6. The Conservation Area is a heritage asset to which I have a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
7. The proposed single storey rear extension and the proposed increase in roof height and change of design to accommodate a dormer extension, would add substantially to the scale of the existing two storey detached house. When combined with the proposed changes to the front elevation, including the replacement of the first floor hung tiles, the addition of a front porch, the loss of the chimney and the alteration and replacement of other architectural elements, the proposal would result in fundamental changes to its scale and architectural design.
8. The appellant considers that the detached houses have a less than consistent use of architectural styles and materials and, therefore, have a less readily identifiable character, and has provided me with a photographic montage of examples of other houses in The Avenue. However, I conclude from my site visit, that it is the consistency of scale of houses in the area, combined with the rich diversity of design, the variety of materials and the detailing of individual houses that defines the prevailing character of the area, notwithstanding recent extensions and developments.
9. The appellant argues that the proposal would preserve the scale and integrity of the existing house by ensuring the extension is subordinate to its mass, height and front elevation line, and has provided an example of an approval for a flat roof dormer extension that the appellant states are common in the area. I find however, that the combined extent and depth of the single storey extension and the increase in roof height with added large dormers, which requires the removal of the pitched roof on the outrigger, result in a harmful increase in the scale of the host dwelling. They would appear as bulky and intrusive additions that are not subordinate to the host dwelling.
10. In addition, when the proposed alterations to the rear of the property are considered with those to the front elevation, including the addition of the roof light to the front roof pitch, new porch and the replacement windows, they would not follow the richness and quality of detailing, nor the materials of the existing house. Although the appellant has set out how they have sought to follow much of the guidance in the Redbridge House Holder Design Guide SPD 2012 (the SPD), in contrast, I find that when considered as a whole, the

proposals would appear as unsympathetic additions and alterations to the appearance of the existing dwelling.

11. I conclude that the proposal, for the reasons given above, would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the London Borough of Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) (the Local Plan), which seek to ensure that development is of high quality design and detail, respects local character, and that extensions are subordinate to the host building by respecting their character in scale, style and form, and incorporate sympathetic roof profiles.
12. Furthermore, the proposal would, due to its scale, form, massing, and unsympathetic alterations and additions, cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Although less than substantial, I have weighed the harm to the significance of the Conservation Area against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use, as required by paragraph 196 of the Framework. The development provides no substantive public benefits nor is it necessary to secure an optimum viable use of the property. Therefore, these considerations do not outweigh the harm caused by the extensions to the significance of the Conservation Area. I, therefore, find that the proposal would be contrary to Policy LP33 of the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure that development has due regard to the importance of preserving or enhancing heritage assets.

Living Conditions

13. The flank wall of the proposed single storey rear extension would be approximately 1 metre from the boundary with No 5 and project approximately 7 metres at this point from the rear elevation of the host property.
14. Despite being set back from the boundary, the projection of the proposed single storey extension would, when taken with the existing impact on enclosure and outlook of the rear extension to 7 The Avenue, result in an overbearing sense of enclosure and loss of outlook when experienced from the ground floor rooms of No 5 that would face towards the proposed extension, including the conservatory. This would have an unacceptable harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of this property, contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Local Plan, which seek to ensure that new development and extensions do not result in adverse impacts on neighbouring amenity, including by loss of outlook. The matters contained within the SPD do not alter my conclusion.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR