



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: 23rd December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3284462

3 Overton Dive, Wanstead, London E11 2NN

- 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 Irfan Motala against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1844/21, dated 1 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part two storey, part single storey side extension. Single storey rear extension with steps down to garden. Loft conversion with rear and side dormers. Two front and two rear rooflights. Detached rear outbuilding.
-

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 appeal property is a 2-storey terraced dwelling located within the Wanstead Park Conservation Area where there is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. This statutory duty is echoed in Policy HC1 of the Redbridge Local Plan (LP). The heritage significance of the Conservation Area is principally associated with the landscaped historic deer park rather than specifically the character and appearance of the dwellings fronting Overton Drive.
4. However, the terrace within which the property is located has a consistent appearance and rhythm when viewed from the road, including matters such as the gaps between the properties at roof level, the projecting 2-storey front gables, the flat roof 2-storey links between the dwellings, hipped roofs and visually prominent chimneys. This consistency of the terrace's character and appearance is reduced to the rear because of the extensions and alterations which have occurred.
5. The proposed development includes a rear single storey addition, an extension to the side of the property at ground/first floor level and an enlarged hipped

- roof which includes the erection of rear and side dormers. As a consequence of the enlargement of the roof, a chimney would be demolished.
6. As identified by the appellant, there are properties with side dormers visible from the road but these are not part of the terrace. From the road, rather than complementing the design of the property and maintaining the appearance of the terrace, the proposed side dormer would appear an incongruous addition to the roofscape of the terrace that would be accentuated by the increased size of the roof which would narrow the gap between the property and 5 Overton Drive. Further, the removal of the chimney would be detrimental to the rhythm of the terrace's roofscape. These elements of the appeal scheme would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the terrace and, as such, would diminish the property's positive contribution to the streetscene of the Conservation Area. The use external materials to match the host property would not sufficiently mitigate this harm.
 7. By reason of siting, size and number, the erection of the proposed rooflights within the front roofslope would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the property, the terrace and the streetscene. The proposed ground floor addition to the rear of the property would reflect the scale and siting of the existing covered terrace. The ground and first floor side extension would result in a wrap-around form of development but the general character of a 2-storey terrace property would be maintained. The proposed rear dormer would be proportionate to the scale of the roof and, as such, would appear a subservient addition.
 8. Although the property's contribution to the appearance of the terrace would change, the proposed alterations to the rear of the property would not be so visually conspicuous so as to be a reason for this appeal to fail. In making this assessment account has been taken of the alterations to the rear of other dwellings, including Nos. 1 and 5.
 9. However, although the alterations to the rear of the property and the rooflights would not be reasons for this appeal to fail, they are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the unacceptable harm which has been identified to the roofscape. The proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm to the heritage significance of the Conservation Area but there are no identified public benefits associated with the appeal scheme which would clearly outweigh this unacceptable harm.
 10. For the reasons given, it is 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 HC1, LP26 and LP30. In addition to heritage considerations and amongst other matters, these policies seek high quality development which is well integrated in terms of design to reinforce the positive and distinctive local character and for residential extensions to complement the character of the building to maintain its appearance and that of the streetscene. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR