



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2020

by Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26/02/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3249694

51 Dover Road, Wanstead, London E12 5DZ

- 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 & Mrs Luke and Ruth Taylor against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4447/19, dated 19 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, replacement of existing roof dormer, alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension, replacement of existing roof dormer, alterations to fenestration at 51 Dover Road, Wanstead, London E12 5DZ, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 4447/19, dated 19 November 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Drawing Nos. 51DOV-101 Rev P1, 51DOV-000 Rev P1, 51DOV-100 Rev P1, 51DOV-102 Rev P1, 51DOV-103 Rev P1, 51DOV-200 Rev P1, and 51DOV-300 Rev P1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. I note that there is a difference between the description in the application form and that used by the Council in its decision notice. I have considered the appeal on the basis of the description shown in the Council's decision notice, as it better describes the proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are: i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building, neighbouring properties and Aldersbrook Conservation Area (CA); and ii) the impact on living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Dover Road lies within Aldersbrook CA which is characterised by tree-lined streets of two-storey, mainly terraced, Edwardian houses in brick, render, stucco and tile with repeating bay windows, giving an attractive uniform rhythm to the streetscape. The character and appearance of the rear elevation of properties on this side of the road is quite different.
5. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling at the Western end of a terrace of six properties (Nos. 51 to 61), the only property along the terrace that has not been extended to the rear on the ground floor. The neighbouring property, No. 53, has a flat-roofed rear dormer that extends across most of the width of the roof. There are similar dormers in the roofs of Nos. 57 and 59. The appeal property lies adjacent to No.49 with its rear groundfloor extension. These extensions lack uniformity varying in design, size, height, depth and materials.
6. It is proposed to: demolish the existing ground-floor outrigger then add a single-storey rear extension; replace two existing roof dormers with a single dormer; replace a window on the rear elevation; re-roof with natural slate; erect new brick boundary wall with metal gates in front garden; and site timber clad bin store in front garden.
7. The Council considers the window replacement, re-roofing and new wall/gate acceptable. From what I have read and what I saw when I visited the site, I see no reason to disagree.
8. The existing outrigger protrudes about 3m out from the rear elevation. The extension at No. 53 also protrudes about 3m. However, this is not the case for all rear extensions in the terrace. I observed from my visit that extensions at No 57 and 61 appear to be deeper. In addition, the neighbouring dwelling at No. 49 is larger and taking into account its rear extension (although set back from the boundary) protrudes at least 7m beyond the line of the terrace's rear elevation.
9. Although Council guidance has a 'rule of thumb' of 3.5m for single-storey rear extensions, the proposal is not of a depth that would result in the extension protruding beyond that of the neighbouring property at No.49. There are flat-roofed extensions in the terrace. The appeal property has an overall height, to ridge, of about 10.5m and the proposed extension would only be 3.5m tall, the same as at No. 53.
10. Therefore, taking these together, the extension would be diminutive and neither out of proportion nor uncharacteristic in relation to both the appeal property and neighbouring properties.

11. The proposed dormer would not cover the width of the roof, and would be both lower than the ridge and set back from the eaves. Having regard to similar dormers on neighbouring roofs, which the appeal proposal would be seen in context with, I consider that the proposed dormer would not be of a size, scale or position such that the appeal property would be dominated or harmed.
12. The proposed timber clad bin store would be small and most of it would be obscured by the proposed/existing boundary walls. I observed something similar in the front garden of the property opposite (No. 50). Therefore, as the store is of a size appropriate for storage of wheeled bins, and the timber cladding can be painted/stained in a colour to match the appeal property, I consider it would not be detrimental to visual amenity.
13. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is of considerable weight and importance. This is reflected in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at paragraph 193 which states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation irrespective of the degree of harm.
14. Neither party has submitted any substantive evidence in respect of the significance of the Aldersbrook CA. However, from my observations during the site visit, the significance of the CA, in so far as it relates to this appeal, is that it is illustrative of the suburban development of this part of the Borough and the architectural style and building techniques of the time. The significance is primarily derived from the uniform frontages of the properties and the architectural detailing of the front elevations.
15. The proposal would reinstate the front boundary wall of the appeal property and restore a feature of the original design that has been lost on many properties in the street. This would have a small positive effect on the CA. The proposals would not alter any other aspects of the appeal property frontage. The alterations to the rear of the appeal property would not be readily visible from the public domain and would only be seen from the rear of a small number of properties in the next street, and would be viewed in context with other similar alterations to the rear of neighbouring properties.
16. Ergo, I find that the effect of the proposal on the conservation area would be a neutral one.
17. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing building, neighbouring properties and Aldersbrook CA. It would comply with policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan) and guidance in both: London Borough of Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019 (SPD), and Aldersbrook CA and Lake House Estate Design Guide 2020. Among other things, these require a high standard of design that complements the existing building, respects local context and maintains or conserves heritage assets.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

18. In the reasons for refusal the Council states that it considers that the rear extension would have a 'serious and adverse effect' on the amenity of occupants of neighbouring properties.

19. However, in its written submission (record of decision) it is concluded that there would be no significant impacts for occupants of Nos. 49 and 53. From what I saw when I visited the site, I would agree.
20. I therefore find that the proposed development would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. It would not conflict with the relevant requirements of policies L26 and L30 of the Local Plan and the SPD, which seek to ensure that new development does not adversely affect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in terms of outlook or loss of daylight/sunlight.

Conditions

21. I have considered the need for conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the NPPF and the Planning Practise Guidance. I have imposed a standard condition specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing dwellinghouse, to protect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Euan FS Pearson

INSPECTOR