
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 A Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3285094

14 Park Road, Wanstead, London E12 5HQ

- 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 Oliver Bamford against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2568/21, dated 14 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing part width single storey rear outrigger & replacement with full width single storey extension, conversion of existing garage into home office/studio space and associated landscaping works.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3285095

14 Park Road, Wanstead, London E12 5HQ

- 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 Oliver Bamford against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2579/21, dated 11 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of existing loft space to create habitable accommodation, including rearward projecting dormer extension & sideways projecting barrel vaulted dormer window.
-

Decision

1. Both Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is for both appeals is the effect of the proposed developments on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an Edwardian semi-detached dwelling, with a single storey detached garage, situated within a primarily residential area which is part of the Aldersbrook and Lake House Conservation Area. There is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area which is echoed in Policy LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan (LP). The Council has published the *Alderbrook Conservation Area and Lake House Estate Design*

Guide which contains advice and guidance to help to preserve the character of the Conservation Area.

4. 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 terraced and semi-detached dwellings set back from the footways to the rear of modest sized landscaped front gardens. There is a consistency and rhythm to the character and appearance of the streetscene, including projecting front gables and the choice of external materials. This pair of semi-detached dwellings, and the adjoining short terrace, has a hipped roof form rather than the predominant gable roofs of the other properties. Although the site visit identified that alterations to the rear have been undertaken, the front elevations of the properties fronting Park Road are generally unaltered.

Appeal A

5. The proposed development includes the erection of rooflights within the side roofslope of the garage to enable this outbuilding to be used for ancillary accommodation. The *Design Guide* refers to historic garages being altered if sufficient justification exists and the design responds well to the main house. The *Design Guide* also refers to rooflights being recessed into the plane of the roof which would occur with the proposed development.
6. The proposed rooflights would face towards the side elevation of the property and the view of them from the road would be substantially screened by the property and the garage. By reason of siting, design and number, the proposed rooflights would not significantly alter the character of the garage and nor would they either detract from the appearance of the host property or appear as visually dominant features within the streetscene. The contribution of the garage and the host property to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved.
7. As part of the proposed development the existing single storey rear addition would be replaced by a full width single storey extension. This element of the appeal scheme would not be visible from the road because of its screening by the property and garage. There would only be limited views from the neighbouring properties because of the adjoining extension, separation distances and intervening substantial vegetation. The character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be harmed by the scale and siting of the proposed extension.
8. The *Design Guide* refers to the design of any new structure responding to the scale, massing and materials of the main house. This does not mean that the design of the main house needs to be slavishly repeated. The aim is not to imitate but to respect the character of the existing house and to maintain its primacy in terms of scale and appearance. No objection to the scale the proposed extension has been raised by the Council with the concerns principally related to its contemporary fenestration, the form of the green roof and choice of external materials.
9. Although the proposed extension would be of a contemporary design and appearance it would not cause material harm to either the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or its heritage significance. However, because of its fenestration and roof form this element of the appeal scheme

would fail to reflect and complement the character and appearance of the Edwardian host property. The expanse of glazing and choice of materials for the openings would visually dominate, rather than reflect, the character of the host property and the extensive areas of glazing would dominate the appearance of both the side and rear elevations.

10. Although the proposed garage rooflights and the scale of the proposed extension would not cause unacceptable harm to the property or the surrounding area, these matters are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the fenestration, materials and roof form of the proposed extension.
11. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and, as such, it would conflict with LP Policies LP26 and LP30. 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, including in terms of style, form and materials.

Appeal B

12. The proposed development comprises alterations to the property's roof, including the erection of rear and side dormers and rooflights within the front roofslope. The rooflights proposed would be of modest size, well separated and sit comfortably within the existing roofslope. These rooflights would neither amount to the cluttering of the roof nor visually dominate the front roofslope. Unacceptable harm would not, therefore, be caused to the character and appearance of either the property or the streetscene by the rooflights.
13. The proposed rear dormer would not be of a scale or siting which would physically or visually dominate the property's rear roofslope. The choice of grey zinc cladding and aluminium window frames would complement the slate covered roof. The design and form of the proposed dormer would reflect those of other similar roof additions which were observed during the site visit. By reason of the overall size of the properties, the proposed dormer would not result in a material loss in the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached dwellings.
14. However, the proposed side dormer with its arched or barrel vaulted roof form would not reflect the predominant character and appearance of other roof extensions within the surrounding area. By reason of its siting and form, this proposed dormer would be a visually prominent addition to the side roofslope and would fail to reflect the character and appearance of either the host property or the roofscape along the streetscene. The side dormer would not be significantly screened from the road by the retained chimney.
15. Although the proposed rear dormer and rooflights would not cause unacceptable harm to the property or the surrounding area, these matters are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the form and siting of the proposed side dormer.
16. By reason of the proposed side dormer, the appeal scheme would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. There would be less than substantial harm caused to the significance of this designated

heritage asset but there are no public benefits associated with the appeal scheme which outweigh the harm identified.

17. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with LP Policies LP26, LP30 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 and for residential extensions to complement the character of the building, including in terms of style and form.

Conclusion

18. Accordingly, and for the reasons given, it is concluded that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR