



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 April 2022

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3289037

115 Woodlands Avenue, Wanstead London E11 3RB

- 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 Robert Spread against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3217/21, dated 27 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as: "Loft conversion with a rear dormer. Front roof lights."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Aldersbrook and Lake House Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house which is situated within the Aldersbrook and Lake House Conservation Area (CA). Woodlands Avenue comprises handsome semi-detached houses that individually and cumulatively create a high-quality residential environment that positively contributes to the character and appearance of the CA.
4. The pairs of semi-detached houses in the street have a mix of gable and hipped roof forms. A small number of pairs have both types. These asymmetrical pairs disrupt the otherwise generally unified appearance of properties in the street. The appeal property and its attached pair retain the original hipped roof form.
5. The proposal would involve a hip to gable addition to the side and formation of a dormer in the expanded roof form to provide additional living accommodation at roof level. Due to their size and siting these additions would unbalance the symmetrical arrangement of the pair of attached properties resulting in an incongruous roof arrangement that would unacceptably harm the appearance of the pair of houses and their surroundings. The proposal would also include the installation of 3 rooflights in the expanded front roof slope. Due to their size, siting and design these elements would result in further harm.

6. This harm to the CA would be less than substantial. In these circumstances Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) requires that the harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I note that the proposal would provide much needed additional space for the appellant's family and provide better space for working from home, however these are private benefits. There are no identified public benefits associated with the appeal proposal that would outweigh the unacceptable harm identified above.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It is therefore contrary to Policies LP26, LP30, and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) which require development to be well-designed and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas. There is also conflict with the aims of the Aldersbrook Conservation Area and Lake House Estate Design Guide (2020).
8. Reference has been made to properties in the street that have been extended at roof level through the construction of hip to gable additions and rear dormers. There is though no evidence before me to demonstrate that planning permission for these additions was gained under current planning policies and after the designation of the Conservation Area. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits and in the context of current planning policy, I attribute limited weight to existing roof additions in the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR