



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2022

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3292827

17 Windsor Road, Wanstead, London, E11 3QU

- 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 Graham Denholm against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 4101/21 dated 29 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer, raise gable wall, 3 front roof lights and new roof covering.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion with rear dormer, raise gable wall and new roof covering at 17 Windsor Road, Wanstead, London, E11 3QU in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 4101/21 dated 29 September 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years, beginning with the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted material details and following approved plans: 22919/SP (Site and Block Plan), 22917/05 (Proposed Elevations) and 22917/04 (Proposed Loft Plan).

Procedural Matters

2. A second appeal has been submitted for a scheme on the same site (APP/W5780/D/22/3292524) which carries the same development description. The only significant difference between the two is that the proposal within this appeal does not include a parapet wall whilst the other scheme does. Whilst site visits were undertaken for the appeals on the same day each case has been considered on their own merits and are the subject of separate decisions.
3. As part of this appeal the appellant has submitted additional comments on 11 April 2022 which enclosed a copy of a planning approval at 15 Richmond Way (ref: 0059/22). On this occasion I have taken additional decision, which postdates the proposal which is the subject of this appeal, into account as the appellant has not provided commentary on the forwarded decision and I do not feel that its acceptance would prejudice any parties.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the Aldersbrook and Lakehouse Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is an end of terrace property within a residential area within the Aldersbrook and Lakehouse Conservation Area (CA). The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, S72, states that in considering proposals with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
6. There are several elements to the appeal proposal including a loft conversion with rear dormer, raise gable wall (a hip to gable roof alteration) and new roof covering. I note that the Council's conservation officer has objected to both the rear dormer and the proposed rooflights within this proposal. Whilst these comments are noted the Council's delegated report confirms that the proposed rear dormer is in compliance with both the Housing Design Guide 2019 (HDG) and the CA Design Guide 2019 (CDG). The proposed conservation area rooflights to the front elevation, and choice of materials, are also considered to generally comply with the same guidance.
7. I have no evidence before me to conclude differently on such matters. It is clear that the refusal reason is based upon the hip to gable roof alteration. For the avoidance of doubt this decision letter will focus upon this element. I note that the appellant contends that the design for proposal within this appeal could have been permitted development but I have no evidence before me to support or evidence this and have thus assessed the scheme as a householder appeal seeking full planning permission.
8. I note the appellant's submission that several properties within the street have built up gable ends or similar and indeed at the time of my site visit I walked up and down Windsor Road and saw examples of such alterations. The road within which the appeal site stands, was not part of CA until 2020. As a result of this I find that such roof alterations similar to the appeal proposal before me are therefore not uncharacteristic – they are part of the sum of all the qualities which distinguish the immediate area within the CA. The HDG guidance confirms that hip to gable conversions will be refused where this would be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area or where this would harm the symmetry of a pair of semi-detached properties. Based upon my site visit, and the evidence before me, I do not find that the proposed roof alterations would be out of character with the pattern of development especially taking into account the roof form at immediately adjacent 19 Windsor Road. I find that the proposal would in fact increase the sense of symmetry across the two sets of terraced properties.
9. The appeal site is not a semi-detached property. Such properties (semi-detached) are generally more sensitive to changes in symmetry due to their ability be viewed side by side and front on together within the context of the street scene. This allows for much stronger visual contrasts in close proximity. The appeal site before me is, however, on the end of a row of five terraced dwellings. When viewed in the street scene most users would view one end, or another, the whole row would be more difficult to appreciate in one go. The proposal would result in asymmetry overall within the terrace as a result of 9 Windsor Road retaining its hipped roof but I do not find this would have a discernible impact on how the host property contributes to the character and appearance of the CA as a result of its position, design and appearance. The

proposal would be in keeping with the appearance of similar extensions in the immediate area, would not detract from the character nor result in harm to the CA.

10. The proposal would be consistent with Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (LP) Policy LP26 which requires proposals to conserve and enhance the character and significance of the historic environment and complement the borough's heritage assets in accordance with LP Policy LP33. LP Policy LP33 seeks to resist development that does not preserve or enhance the character of designated heritage assets and promotes high quality design that respects the local character of the area. The proposal would also be consistent with the overarching design objectives of both the HDG and CDG.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR