



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2022 by S Wilson LLB MSc LRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3295065

35 Hereford Road, Wanstead, London E11 2EA

- 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 John Whittaker against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 5048/21, dated 23 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'to form a hip to gable roof, dormer to rear roof slope and conservation rooflights to front roof slope.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as 'to form a hip to gable roof, dormer to rear roof slope and conservation rooflights to front roof slope in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 5048/21, dated 23 December 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1416-317-B1; 1416-317-B2; 1416-317-B3.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. There is an appeal at the adjoining property, making up the semi-detached pair, for a similar hip to gable roof extension, dormer to rear roof slope and conservation rooflights to front roof slope. I attended both during my site visit; however, the appeals are from separate appellants at different properties and are not linked, therefore I have considered them separately on their individual merits.
4. Other aspects of the proposal including the conservation area rooflights, insertion of a window on the flank wall, and the rear dormer have been

considered acceptable by the Council. On the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree. I have therefore concentrated this recommendation on the principal contentious element, which is the hip to gable extension and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Wanstead Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal building is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof. It is a largely original example and forms a pleasant symmetry with its adjoining neighbour. There is a similar pair at Nos 31 and 33. The remainder of the road are also two storey and semi-detached, set back from and facing the road and thus there is general consistency in size, scale, type and period features. These elements contribute positively to the significance of the CA. Gable roof forms dominate and there are some examples of mismatched roof designs within pairs. One such is opposite the appeal building.
6. Looking beyond Hereford Road, there are six hip roofed, semi-detached properties on Buckingham Road, of a similar style to the appeal property. Whilst there is one pair with hipped roofs remaining without addition, there is also one pair of hip to gable conversions and one pair with one semi converted to gable end and the other remains as a hipped roof. This variety of roofs forms a feature of the character of the immediate area and extends throughout Buckingham Road, where there is no clear preservation of hipped roofs, nor any uniformity or pattern remaining.
7. The conversion of the appeal building to a gable roof would unbalance the pair and the symmetry would obviously be lost as a result, as would the prominence of the chimneys and how they protrude from the roof shape. However, the immediate area is so mixed in this regard, even between individual pairs, that such a change would not amount to being harmful. In addition, the significance of the street's building to space ratio, its constant rhythm of similar building types, their presentation to the street and traditional design detailing would not be affected.
8. I am mindful that the two pairs which include the appeal building are different to others, but only slightly, owing to them not having a forward projecting gable over the bay windows. This slight difference would not be sufficient to resist the proposed change, particularly when the original roof form of the four buildings has already been interrupted by a side dormer to No 33, which is highly visible from the street.
9. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Whilst the proposal in isolation would unbalance the semi-detached pair, due to the frequency of hip to gable roof extensions occurring next to hipped roofs and the prevalence of gable ended roofs, the proposal would not harm the intrinsic character or appearance of the CA which would, as a result, be preserved.
10. Consequently, the proposal would comply with Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), and Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) insofar as they require development to be of high-quality design that preserves the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, a condition is necessary to require the development to accord with the approved plans, to provide certainty. Furthermore, a condition requiring materials used in the extension to match the existing building is necessary in the interest of preserving the character and appearance of the host dwelling and providing a good quality end result.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, the scheme would comply with the development plan and, as such, I recommend the appeal be allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the stated conditions.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR