



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2019

by Adrian Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3224879

46 Draycot Road, Wanstead, London E11 2NX

- 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 Uzaira Farooq against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4802/18, dated 22 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion featuring side and rear dormers, raising of the rear projected roof and a Velux rooflight to front roof slope.
-

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 host dwelling and area.

Reasons

3. Draycot Road is characterised by a mixture of large detached and semi-detached Edwardian style homes, set back from the road. Whilst it is outside the Wanstead Conservation Area (CA), it is nevertheless within an attractive residential setting, close to George Green. No 46 is a fine detached house, which typifies a generally consistent character within the street and contributes to the quality of the area generally. It is robustly detailed and broken down into a series of smaller well-proportioned subordinate elements. To the rear is a spacious rear garden bordered by mature vegetation.
4. The roof alterations required to facilitate construction of the two dormers would raise the eaves and height of the side projection, which in turn would also increase the roof pitch on the front roof slope of that element. Even though the ridge would still be below the main roof, the changes to the eaves height and roof pitch would unacceptably alter the proportions of that part of the house and result in it appearing unbalanced.
5. The very large rear dormer would have a crown roof to help it fit into the extended roof, but its form would be out of keeping with the character of the host building and would do little to reduce the overall bulk of the dormer and its dominance on the rear roof slope. I acknowledge views of the rear of the property from George Green are filtered by vegetation, but the vegetation is

likely to be less effective during the winter months when it is not in leaf. Moreover, the boundary vegetation could be removed.

6. I appreciate that the side dormer was amended during the course of the application, which has reduced its width and encroachment onto the adjoining roof slope. Nevertheless, it would still be a prominent feature on the side of the house. I acknowledge Nos 45 and 44 have similar side dormers, but their presence is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. If anything, they demonstrate how intrusive such development can be.
7. The appellant has cited several other applications for roof extensions and dormers in the area that were approved by the Council. However, none of them appear to be directly comparable in design to the appeal scheme, and I do not have full details of the circumstances that led to these proposals being accepted. In any event, I have considered the appeal scheme on its own merits.
8. I note the proposal would provide two additional bedrooms and a shower room without increasing the footprint of the building, but this does not justify the harmful effects of the scheme on the host dwelling and surrounding area, notwithstanding it is outside the CA.
9. Therefore, I conclude that by reason of their scale, appearance and positioning, the proposed roof alterations and dormer windows would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. In this regard, the proposal is contrary to Policies LP26 (Promoting High Quality Design) and L30 (Household Extensions) of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018). These policies promote good design and extensions that complement the character of the existing building, are subordinate and maintain the appearance of the street scene.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Adrian Caines

INSPECTOR