



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8TH November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3296876

9 Spratt Hall Road, Wanstead, London, E11 2RQ

- 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 Jhund against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0249/22, dated 20 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a timber clad rear dormer extension & low profile rooflight to the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the wider area, including the Wanstead Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Wanstead Village Conservation Area (CA) which includes a busy and vibrant town centre and an eclectic mix of surrounding building styles, ages and uses, all set around a core group of three separate and distinctive areas of large green open spaces. Its special interest is derived from the cohesion of its variety that harmoniously pulls together to create a distinctive village character.
4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling and is a typical example of the terraced and semi-detached homes built around the turn of the last century which tightly line the south-west side of Spratt Hall Road behind reasonably shallow frontages. The proposal includes a loft conversion involving the construction of a timber clad, 'box-like' dormer to the rear roof slope and a single rooflight to the front elevation.
5. The height of the dormer would match the height of the dwelling's ridge line and would be only marginally set in from the outside edge of the roof and up from the eaves. It would dominate almost entirely the rear roof slope, appearing not as a subservient addition but rather as an additional storey at second floor level, wholly changing the pitched roof profile of the dwelling. Moreover, its dominant and intrusive presence would be further exaggerated by

the use of timber cladding and a single pivot window with a strong horizontal emphasis to its front face, neither of which would show any respect for the composition of the existing building, regardless of the sustainable qualities of timber as a finishing material. Although the dormer would be out of sight from Spratt Hall Road, it would be openly seen as an incongruous presence from the gardens of neighbouring properties and in the outlook from the backs of dwellings along Addison Road from views into the CA.

6. I recognise that there are examples of other dormer windows in the area and indeed I note that planning permission (Ref 0746/18) was granted in 2018 for works including a rear dormer at the appeal property. However, neither the past permission, nor any examples that I saw from the back of the appeal site are directly comparable to the appeal proposal either in terms of appearance or visual impact.
7. Turning to the front rooflight, I saw several examples of rooflights on a number of properties along Spratt Hall Road. These varied in terms of numbers, sizes and positions. None struck me as particularly intrusive or harmful to the overall character of the street scene. The single rooflight proposed to the front of No 9 would not be overlarge in my opinion and would be set fairly high, above the apex of a decorative gable feature. In my assessment it would be an inconspicuous change to the roof that would have no harmful effect upon the appearance of the dwelling or wider street scene.
8. Overall, notwithstanding my findings as they relate to the rooflight, I find that the rear dormer window would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. As such, it follows that the character and appearance of the CA would fail to be preserved. This would be detrimental to its significance as a heritage asset.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to an appeal decision in 2019 relating to 6 Spratt Hall Road (Ref APP/W5780/D/19/3220430). In that case the Inspector found the proposed rear dormer would be comparable in scale and design to other dormers seen in the vicinity of the site. For reasons I have explained, that would not be directly the case in this instance. Even then however, the Inspector found that a level of harm still arose but that the less than substantial harm to the CA was outweighed by the public benefit of replacing the dwelling's concrete roof tiles with slate. He found that this would improve the appearance of No 6 when seen from public vantage points.
10. I note that in this case it is also proposed to replace the concrete interlocking roof tiles with slate. This would have a similar beneficial impact on the street scene. However, even though the level of harm to the CA's significance as a heritage asset would be less than substantial, the weight I attach to the public benefit from the change in roof tiles at No 9 is far outweighed by the level of harm that I have identified from the unsympathetic form and appearance of the proposed rear dormer window.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, I find that there would be harm to the character and appearance of 9 Spratt Hall Road and the wider area, including the Wanstead Village Conservation Area. As such, there would be conflict with Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030, adopted in 2018, insofar as they require the design of development, including household

extensions, to be high quality, respectful and complementary to an existing building and an area's character, and to conserve and enhance the character and significance of the historic environment. The proposal would also conflict with the similar heritage conservation aims of The London Plan 2021 Policy HC1.

12. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR