



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2019

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3234446

32 The Avenue, Wanstead, London E11 2EF

- 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 A Cook against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1540/19, dated 7 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wanstead Grove Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a modern double fronted two-storey detached dwelling located on the south side of The Avenue in the area of Wanstead. The property benefits from a large hard landscaped front and side space that follows the corner with Kendon Close, a cul-de-sac of similar house types. The area is residential in character with a variety of house styles and more elaborate detached villas to the north side of the street.
4. The site is located within the Wanstead Grove CA which is characterised for its varied architecture of Victorian and Edwardian buildings. The Avenue consists of a blended form of modern housing development and late Victorian and Edwardian housing, with fine examples of arts and crafts influences.
5. There is much symmetry to the appeal dwelling as it is double fronted with a central main entrance. The dwelling has a sense of spaciousness around it given it has land to its side boundary and the fact it is located on a corner plot, although it is visually prominent within the street scene due to turning the corner with the access road into Kendon Close.
6. The proposed two-storey extension would in-fill the majority of the existing side garden with the front and rear building lines flush with the host dwelling. The Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2012, advises that two-storey extensions provide a 1m set back to the

front with extensions to be set back by at least 1m from the side boundary to reduce their visual prominence. No part of the development complies with this guidance with only the hipped roof above the extension that would be set down from the ridgeline of the host dwelling.

7. The lack of set back to the front building line together with the proposed matching bay window elongates the dwelling and would make the extension appear more pronounced within the street scene. The extension therefore does not appear as a subordinate form of development which is one of the requirements of the SPD, together with the aims of Policy LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018-2030, (adopted 2018).
8. No architectural detailing has been included on the side wall of the extension to break up its mass, as is supported within the SPD, and this lack of detail would further emphasise its prominence when seen in views from the west. Furthermore, the addition of a parapet wall would be a new feature that is out of character with this house type, and would cause an imbalance to the symmetry of the roof, increasing its visual impact.
9. The extension would therefore appear dominant and incongruous in this location and would not make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Its impact on the CA would be one that would neither enhance nor preserve its character or appearance.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to other extensions in The Avenue, but these are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. The dwellings are different house types and their extensions do not share the same characteristics in terms of design, scale and mass, or the location on a corner plot. In any case, their planning histories are not before me, and regardless of this, I have assessed this proposal on its own individual merits.
11. For the reasons above, the proposal would conflict with policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Local Plan. These policies all require new development to, amongst other things, respect local character and the surrounding area in respect of massing, scale and design and protect the built and historic environment.
12. The effect of the proposal would result in harm that requires clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework indicates that less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Whilst I have had regard to the benefits to the occupier by providing additional living space, this does not alter my conclusions on the main issue, or outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Other Matters

13. Despite the letter of support to the proposal, this does not alter my decision as I have found harm to the street scene, and character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Scott INSPECTOR