

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 October 2021 by Max Webb

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3279210

15 Richmond Way, Wanstead, London E11 3QT

- 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 Georgia Day-Phillips against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1755/21, dated 23 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2021.
 - The development is dormer to main rear and side roof slopes and 3 rooflights, replace rear door and window with folding doors and additional rooflight to existing rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The part of the appeal that relates to the loft conversion is dismissed.
2. The part of the appeal that relates to the alterations to the existing rear extension is allowed and planning permission is granted for rooflight to rear extension and replace rear door and window with bi-folding doors at 15 Richmond Way, Wanstead, London E11 3QT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1755/21, dated 23 April 2021.

Appeal Procedure

3. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

4. A split decision has been recommended allowing only part of the proposal. This has been done on the basis that the two parts of the proposal are clearly severable.
5. Whilst conducting the site visit it was evident that the works related to the rear extension have been started. The additional rooflight to the rear extension has been installed and it appeared the bi-folding doors were in the process of being installed. The appeal will therefore be considered on this basis.
6. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have had regard to this as a material consideration however, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The issues most relevant to this appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no

requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

7. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Aldersbrook Conservation Area and Lake House Estate.

Reasons for the Recommendation

8. The appeal site is an end terrace property, located within the Aldersbrook Conservation Area and Lake House Estate (CA). The CA derives its significance from the range of Edwardian style dwellings and their traditional features, although recent alterations have eroded some of these. The Aldersbrook Conservation Area and Lake House Estate Design Guide (2020) (Design Guide) states that protecting the remaining traditional features is therefore of particular importance. The appeal property positively contributes to the character of the CA through its traditional features, including hipped roof and fenestration.

Loft conversion

9. The proposal seeks to convert the loft space and would include a dormer on the side elevation. This would be visible from the street and would interrupt the hipped roof on the side elevation. The terrace group, of which the appeal dwelling is part, has matching hipped roof dwellings at each end and the proposed side dormer would disrupt this relatively symmetrical appearance. Although the neighbouring property has a hip-to-gable extension, and there are other gable end roof designs in the area, the proposed side dormer would not appear in-keeping with this gable appearance or with the traditional hipped appearance of the side roofs on other nearby properties.
10. There are limited examples of side dormers in the vicinity of the appeal site, such as at 10 Windsor Road and 96 Belgrave Road. The side dormer at No.10 has a matching side dormer on the opposing end terrace property and therefore does not appear as unsympathetic to the host dwelling as the proposed side dormer. The side dormer at No.96 is on a dwelling that forms part of a terrace group that does not have matching hipped roof dwellings either end. It is therefore also less disruptive to the character of the CA than the proposed side dormer.
11. The proposal would include the addition of a rear box dormer and small rooflight. This dormer would have a flat roof and would thus appear at odds with the pitched roof of the host dwelling. The dormer would be positioned in close proximity to the rooflight, the shared boundary and chimney. It would therefore appear cramped on the rear roof slope. Although the dormer would be in line with first floor rear windows, the rooflight would be poorly positioned with regards to the windows on the rear of the dwelling and thus would fail to respond to the appearance of the existing fenestration. Whilst on its own the rear dormer would be modest in size, when combined with the proposed rooflight and side dormer, it would be a substantial addition that would appear dominant over the host dwelling.
12. Although there are a number of box dormers on the appeal street, including some larger than the proposed rear dormer, they do not form the predominant

character of the area. Therefore, the proposed rear dormer would appear out of keeping with the appeal street. Furthermore, the existing pitched roof of the appeal property makes a positive contribution to the CA and the flat roof of the dormer would not preserve this, regardless of the presence of a small number of flat roofed box dormers on the appeal street.

13. The side and rear dormers would not increase the footprint of the site and would use matching windows to the host dwelling. However, this would not diminish the harm identified above. Although the Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2019) says side dormers and rear box dormers may be appropriate, the Design Guide suggests that these should respect the existing roof slope. As has been outlined above, the proposed side and rear dormers would not respect the existing roof slope.
14. The proposed front rooflights would be set sufficiently into the roof and respect the fenestration of the front of the property, in line with guidance in the Design Guide. They would also be relatively small and would be somewhat hidden from public views by the front gable feature, so would not add visual clutter to the front roof slope. In isolation, the proposed front rooflights may not result in significant harm to the character or appearance of the CA. However, this does not minimise the harm from the other elements of the loft conversion. This part of the development would not be clearly severable from the remainder of the loft conversion and therefore cannot be granted permission as part of the split decision in this appeal.
15. As the development would only be seen from a small section of the CA, there would be less than substantial harm to the heritage asset. In such circumstances, Paragraph 202 of the Framework requires that the harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. It is understood the appellant seeks additional living space; however this would be a private rather than public benefit. It would thus not outweigh the harm caused by the development to the heritage asset.
16. Overall, the loft conversion would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. It would therefore not comply with Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted 2018) (Local Plan) which together aim to ensure development that respects local character, including roof profile, and in particular preserves or enhances the significance of heritage assets. It would also not conform with Policy HC1 of the London Plan (adopted 2021), which looks to promote development proposals that are sympathetic to the significance of heritage assets. Likewise, it would go against the aims of the Design Guide, which seek to preserve the character of the CA, in particular suggesting that roof alterations will generally only be acceptable on rear roof slopes, and that rear dormers should be inset from the side of the dwelling by 1 metre.

Alterations to rear extension

17. The development includes alterations to the rear extension, comprising of the installation of a rooflight and bi-folding doors. This rooflight is positioned symmetrically with the existing rooflight on the rear extension and this ensures the fenestration is not disrupted. The bi-folding doors would sit more symmetrically with the fenestration of the rear of the property than the existing door and small window, and also line up symmetrically with the rooflights on the rear extension. As the findings above prevent the construction of the box

dormer and rooflight on the rear roof slope, the effects of the cumulative level of glazing on the rear of the property would be minimised and would appear in-keeping with the appearance of the CA.

18. The alterations to the rear extension would thus preserve the character and appearance of the CA. They would comply with Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Local Plan and Policy HC1 of the London Plan. They would also conform with the aims of the Design Guide, which looks to ensure alterations to the property respect the character of the existing house.

Conditions

19. Given that the part of the appeal that is recommended to be allowed relates to a rooflight that is in place and a set of bi-folding doors in the process of being installed, it is considered there is no need for the standard time condition or conditions ensuring compliance with plans or the use of matching materials.

Conclusion and Recommendation

20. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole, I recommend that in relation to the loft conversion the appeal should be dismissed. However, I recommend that in relation to the alterations to the rear extension, the appeal should be allowed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

21. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree a split decision should be issued as set out above.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR