
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2020

by Andre Pinto BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/20/3245418

46 Mansfield Road, Wanstead, London E11 2JN

- 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 Phil Harrington against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4519/19, dated 21 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is dormer to rear slope and 2 rooflights to front slope, increase height to kitchen and landing window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached two storey house located in a fairly quiet residential area characterised by semi-detached and terraced two storey Victorian houses.
4. The properties are of a similar height, share a broadly consistent building line and a common architectural vernacular. Together, these features combine to give the area a pleasant harmonious quality.
5. The proposed development is for the erection of a dormer to the rear slope of 46 Mansfield Road and 2 roof lights to the front slope. The proposed rear roof extension would not be easily perceived from the public highway although the 2 proposed roof lights to the front slope would be.
6. The Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (Housing Design SPD) states that new roof lights will be generally acceptable if placed in line with the windows of the first floor of the existing building.
7. Although the proposed roof lights are broadly aligned to the first floor windows, due to their significant size and form, these would appear unduly prominent in relation to the existing building, as visually they would not be clearly subordinate to the existing first floor windows.

8. The proposed rear dormer would create an extension which would run the full width of the property, therefore covering the majority of the rear roof slope.
9. The Housing Design SPD does state that dormer windows or roof extensions must remain subordinate within the roof slope and that it is important these do not appear a dominant feature. Therefore, the main question is one of appearance and the visual impact of the proposed extension. As such, it must be viewed and assessed in light of its context.
10. The proposed rear roof extension would not be easily viewed or perceived from public land as it would be largely concealed from public view by the existing ridgeline. As such, the proposed development would have a limited impact on the character and appearance of the area.
11. Furthermore, the proposed materials for the extension to the rear are aligned with the existing materials which would further assist in minimising the visual impact of the proposal.
12. In conclusion, although I have not found a conflict in terms of the proposed rear roof extension, I do find that the proposed 2 rooflights to the front roof slope would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. On this basis, the application would be contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) which aim to, amongst other objectives, promote high quality design and ensure that household extensions are subordinate to the existing building, and the Housing Design SPD.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has brought to my attention other examples of back roof extensions built to a similar scale and size than that proposed for 46 Mansfield Road, namely 34, 44 and 62 Mansfield Road as well as 1 Sydney Road. The roof extension in 1 Sydney Road is particularly prominent in the street scene as it is a corner plot with a significant rear extension extending between two parapet walls, clearly visible from public land.
14. I acknowledge the relevance of these other examples of similar types of development in the proximity of the appeal site. I am not fully aware of the details or particular circumstances of these other proposals, but I do note that the Housing Design SPD was adopted in 2019, therefore the local policy context for such type of development has changed quite recently.
15. In any case, I must determine the proposal before me on its own merits and for the reason stated and I consider the proposed development to be harmful. I have, nonetheless, taken such existing development into account when making my assessment of the proposal's effects on the character and appearance of the area.
16. The development falls within the "Zone of Influence" of one European designated site, namely the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. It is my duty, as the competent authority, to consider whether the proposed development would constitute a likely significant effect on the sensitive interest features of the designated site as set out within Regulations 63 and 64 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
17. It is anticipated that, without mitigation, new developments in this area could have a significant effect on the sensitive interest features of these European

designated sites, through increased recreational pressure, particularly when considered 'in combination' with other plans and projects.

18. Therefore, by virtue of its protected status, an Appropriate Assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (CHSR) would be required were I minded to allow the appeal. Nevertheless, considering that the appeal is to be dismissed on other issues mentioned in this decision, no further consideration is required on this matter.

Conclusion

19. In conclusion, and for the reason given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Andre Pinto

INSPECTOR