



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/22/3304533

Beechworth, 5 The Green, Wanstead, Redbridge, London, E11 2NT

- 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 B Rahman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 1543/22, dated 11 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2022.
 - The development proposed was described as '*partial hip to gable and rear dormer*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with a rear dormer and a hip to gable roof alteration at Beechworth, 5 The Green, Wanstead, Redbridge, London, E11 2NT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1543/22, dated 11 May 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos R91727/1, R91727/2, R91727/5, R91727/6 Rev B, R91727/7 Rev B, R91727/8 Rev B, R91727/10, R91727/11 Rev A and R91727/12 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description I have used in my formal decision reflects the wording used by the Council on their decision notice. This better reflects the scope of the proposed development compared with that which was given on the original application form and which I have quoted in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. The Council has raised no concern with the proposed rear dormer, which they advise is identical to that which was granted planning permission in April 2022 (Ref 0728/22). The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed hip to gable roof alteration on the character and appearance of the existing building and the wider area, including the Wanstead Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. 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.
5. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached Edwardian dwelling that sits within a mixed group of properties along The Green and which line and face towards one side of George Green, a rectangular open space which is criss-crossed with public footpaths from all four corners and with mature tree planting in each of its quadrants. No 5 has a side hipped roof and a prominent two-storey forward projecting gable, with a two-storey bay to the front, set to the building's outside edge and which extends significantly beyond the main part of the dwelling as a dominant feature. This arrangement is mirrored by the attached property at No 7. The row of buildings along this stretch are fairly tightly arranged and reflect a mix of architectural styles and detailing, typical of the CA's character more widely. As such there is no particular rhythm or uniformity to the pattern of development that is significant.
6. The appeal proposal would project the existing ridge line of No 5 sideways to enable the side hipped roof to be built up to a gable in a seamless fashion. This would undeniably disrupt the symmetrical roof form of the building overall. However, I am not persuaded that this would appear necessarily awkward or result in any visual harm.
7. Gabled elevations are as equally commonplace throughout the CA as hipped roofs, as is the case with symmetrical and asymmetrical building forms. The charm of the CA is the mix of building types and the absence of routine homogeneity, including often between immediately neighbouring buildings. An asymmetrical building along this part of The Green would not look incongruous or out of keeping with the established development pattern. In any event, due to the deeply recessed position of the dwelling's main ridge, its visual subservience behind the dominant front gable, and the limited space between the building and No 3, the hip to gable change would have very limited visual presence from the public domain. Even if the change to the composition of the building as a whole was to be evident in views from the road and George Green, which I doubt, for the reasons given I am satisfied that the alteration would not be harmful.
8. Having regard to the foregoing, I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the existing building or the wider street scene. As such, the changes to No 5 would have no impact upon the character or appearance of the Wanstead Village Conservation Area, the significance of which as a heritage asset would be unaffected. The proposal would therefore be compliant with Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030, adopted in 2018, as far 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 comply with the similar design quality and heritage conservation aims of The London Plan 2021 Policies D3 and HC1, as well as the

National Planning Policy Framework's policies for conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Conditions

9. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure that the proposal is finished with materials to match the existing.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR