
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2019

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc MILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3228683

37 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 Anna Potts against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0847/19, dated 26 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "loft conversion with hip to gable roof conversion, dormer to rear roof slope and Velux rooflights to from roof slope".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion with rear dormer, hip to gable roof alteration, four front roof lights at 37 Draycot Road, Wanstead, London E11 2NX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 0847/19, dated 26 February 2019, 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: 1416/129/LP (location and block plan), dated 26-02-10; 1416/129-3 (existing and proposed plans), dated 08-01-19.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has altered the description of the development on the decision notice to read "loft conversion with rear dormer, hip to gable roof alteration, four front roof lights". The appeal questionnaire also uses this altered description and I have used this description in my formal decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a large semi-detached dwelling on Draycot Road in an established residential area of Wanstead. The appeal site abuts the Wanstead Village Conservation Area but is not located within it. Draycot Road is characterised by a number of large detached and semi-detached properties. It was evident from my site visit that there is a varied mixture of architectural styles along Draycot Road, which leads to an interesting and pleasing street scene.
5. The appeal scheme proposes to extend the side of the property with a hip to gable roof extension. In addition, a rear dormer is proposed which would be L-shaped and extend over the existing rear outrigger building. The loft conversion would also include four new rooflights being built in the front roof.
6. The proposed extension of the roof would mean the property now has a continuous roofline which extends the full width of the property. Whilst the proposals do increase the bulk and mass of the roof, the proposals are of a high-quality design which integrates well with the host property. I am satisfied that this would not be an incongruous addition to the host building.
7. The Council has stated that the proposals would result in an unbalancing effect on the attached dwelling, which would have a significant impact on the character of the host building. It is evident that the two properties have undergone a number of changes since their original construction. There are differences between the fenestrations and external surfaces between the two dwellings which has removed some of original symmetry. I recognise that the roof extension is likely to erode this symmetry further, but not to the detriment to the overall character and appearance of the two dwellings.
8. Furthermore, the appellant has stated that a hip to gable conversion and rear dormer could be implemented under permitted development (PD) rights. The appellant has submitted plans showing what could be built without planning permission. The PD scheme would differ from the appeal proposals as the roof line would not extend the full width of the property, and the property would maintain a single storey side extension. This would represent a poorly designed scheme and would not integrate well with the host property. The PD scheme would also impact the symmetry of the existing building, but this would be more harmful to the character and appearance of the building than the appeal scheme by virtue of its poor design.
9. I am satisfied that if the appeal proposals were not erected, there is every likelihood that such a fallback scheme would be built. From the plans submitted, I judge that this fallback would have a significantly greater impact on the character and appearance of the host property, and the surrounding area than the appeal scheme. I therefore give the fallback position considerable weight.
10. The appellant has indicated that a number of properties on Draycot Road have been significantly altered since their original construction. It was evident from my site visit that a number of properties on Draycot Road have gable ends, and this includes no. 36 adjacent to the appeal property. Given the variety of the property styles on Draycot Road and the differences in roof types, I find that the appeal proposal would not be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed additions to the appeal

property would be of a high-quality design and integrate well with the existing street scene.

11. The Council has cited an appeal decision at 10 Abbotsford Road, Ilford for a proposed hip to gable conversion. In that instance an Inspector concluded that the proposals would result in an incongruous roof form. I have not been presented with the full details of that scheme and so cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same. In any case all applications and appeals must be determined on their own merits and that is what I have done in this case.
12. Consequently, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such there would be no conflict with policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 - 2030 and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is of a high standard of design which contributes to the character of the area. The Council has referred to policy 7.8 of the London Plan, however I do not find this is relevant because it relates to heritage assets and archaeology.
13. Having regard to all matters raised, it is concluded that the appeal should succeed and planning permission should be granted subject to conditions

S Shapland

INSPECTOR