



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2022

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/22/3290495

5 and 7 Broad Oak, Woodford Green IG8 0LH

- 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 Catherine Barrett and John Connolly against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4109/21, dated 29 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is replacement of main roof with a steeper pitched roof to a pair of semi-detached houses, new dormer to rear face of each house, two front facing roof windows to each house, and formation of new bedroom with en suite in the roof space of each house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form which differs from that on the Council's decision notice. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed and neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
3. There is some variation in the name of the appellants as given on the planning application and appeal forms. As the right of appeal rests with the original applicants I have taken the names in the heading above from the planning application form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscape, with due regard to the Woodford Broadway Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of two semi-detached dwellings and is part of a cul-de-sac characterised by dwellings of a similar scale and arrangement which create a pleasant suburban streetscape. Due to the sloping topography of the area, the step-down of the roof heights along the streetscape is a defining characteristic of the cul-de-sac and adds to a relative sense of rhythm in views of this group of dwellings. Although there is some variation in the external

materials of the dwellings, this does not undermine the relatively consistent nature of the streetscape arising from the form and arrangement of the dwellings.

6. The appeal site is within the Woodford Broadway Conservation Area (CA). The appellants have provided extracts from the CA Appraisal, which sets out the key characteristics of the CA including complementary architectural detailing and use of materials across different areas within the CA. The quality and character of the building stock is derived largely from the collective effect rather than the contribution of individual buildings. Based on what I have seen and read, it is these features that contribute to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.
7. However, within the context of the CA, the cul-de-sac of Broad Oak is a relatively recent addition. Nevertheless, despite its modern suburban appearance, this cul-de-sac is an understated feature within the CA and it does not have a significant negative impact on the overall character of the CA.
8. The proposal includes the replacement of the pitched roof of this pair of dwellings with a new roof of a greater height and steeper pitch. The resultant ridge height would project above the immediate neighbouring dwellings, in particular that to the west which currently has a higher ridge height. The proposal would therefore not reflect the step-down in the ridge heights along the streetscape, and would appear as a jarring element in views along the cul-de-sac. The difference in the pitch of the roof compared to its immediate neighbours would exacerbate this incongruous appearance. The proposed front roof lights would also be placed awkwardly high close to the ridge and would not reflect the arrangement of windows on the main front elevation, which would add further to the unfortunate appearance of the development.
9. The appellants refer to dwellings in the south east corner of the cul-de-sac which have a greater ridge height. However, these dwellings respect the step-down character of the streetscape and therefore do not set a precedent for the proposed increase in ridge height and the unsympathetic relationship with neighbouring dwellings which would result from the appeal proposal. The front roof lights of those dwellings also demonstrated the harm to character and appearance which can arise from roof lights of an unsuitable placement and design.
10. Reference has also been made to solar panels installed on front roof slopes of nearby dwellings. However, although these introduce a different treatment of front roof slopes, they are of a different form and appearance to the development before me and do not establish a context that is sufficient to support the proposal.
11. The Council has not objected to the dormers on the rear roofslopes. However, a lack of objection on this matter does not negate the harm I have identified in respect of other elements of the proposal.
12. I am mindful that the CA Appraisal sets out that Broad Oak is of no historic or architectural interest. But for the reasons stated above the proposal would introduce an incongruous element into this understated streetscape, and would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA.

13. I have had regard to the benefits arising from the proposal. The development would improve accommodation for the appellants' families, but these private benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. The economic benefits arising from construction would be of a limited degree over a limited period of time. Therefore, whilst the harm to the CA would be less than substantial, there are no public benefits that would outweigh that harm.
14. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscape and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the design and heritage requirements of policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018.
15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR