
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22nd December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3284988

11 St Margarets Road, Wanstead, London E12 5DR

- 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 Nicholas Marks against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2751/21, dated 27 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the installation of 5 solar panels to the front façade of the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The proposed development includes the erection of 5 solar panels on the front roofslope of a 2-storey dwelling situated within the Aldersbrook and Lake House Conservation Area. The appellant has identified various national and local policies which support renewable energy projects to reduce greenhouse gases. The electricity generated by the proposed panels would be capable of being stored by batteries and used to charge electric vehicles. These policies and the generation of domestic renewable electricity are material to the determination of this appeal.
4. However, there is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and this duty is echoed in Policy LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan (LP). In the Council's *Aldersbrook and Lake House Conservation Area Design Guide* traditional photovoltaic and solar hot water panels are noted to be capable of being visually obtrusive and where they are to be placed on front roof slopes they should be chosen with care and consideration of the appearance of the primary façade.
5. The heritage significance of the Conservation Area is principally associated with its origins as an Edwardian residential suburb which has a consistency of layout and design of dwellings. The layout includes predominantly 2-storey dwellings set back from the footways to the rear of modest sized landscaped front

gardens. These dwellings have projecting front gables. There is a consistency to the rhythm, materials, roofscape, character and appearance of the streetscene and the property makes a positive contribution to the streetscene.

6. Although the roofing materials are not original, because of their siting, materials, cumulative size and degree of projection above the roofslope the proposed panels would visually dominate the property's front elevation. The proposed panels would be an incongruous addition to the roofslope which would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the property. The consistency of the rhythm, character and appearance of the streetscene, particularly the roofscape, would be significantly disrupted by the erection of the proposed panels.
7. For the same reasons, the appeal scheme would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposed development would, however, lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset and this needs to be assessed against the public benefits of the appeal scheme. The appellant has referred to national and local policies that support renewable energy, the orientation of the property and the cost of alternative roof based approaches to generate domestic electricity. However, these benefits do not outweigh the unacceptable harm identified to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the significance of this heritage asset.
8. It is, therefore, concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with LP Policies LP26 and LP33. In addition to heritage considerations, these policies seek high quality development which is well integrated in terms of design to reinforce the positive and distinctive local character. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR