



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2023

**by J Smith MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 21 December 2023**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/23/3324055**

### **16 New Wanstead, Wanstead, Redbridge, London E11 2SN**

- 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 David Abrahamovitch against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref 0344/23, dated 2 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2023.
  - The development proposed is described as *Remove chimney. Increase roof ridge and height. Loft conversion. Rear pitched roof alterations with infill dormer extension with two sash windows. (Summary).*
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Preliminary Matters**

2. The description of the proposed development has been amended during the application by the Council. This description has been used in the banner heading of this decision.

### **Main Issue**

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the Wanstead Village Conservation Area.

### **Reasons**

4. The appeal property is a detached, locally listed building located adjacent to the Wanstead Village Conservation Area (CA). The building makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA as part of its setting. This is principally due to its size and age, which are similar to properties found within the CA, thus reading as a continuation of the CA's character and appearance extending beyond its boundary. The significance of the CA itself derives primarily from the presence of eighteenth and nineteenth century buildings which contribute to the early settlement of Wanstead, especially the larger, more distinctive properties.
5. There is a flat roof two storey extension to the rear of the property. Whilst it is evident from my site visit that a number of changes have been made to the rear, I do not consider that these changes have significantly eroded its character. The building appears as a mid-nineteenth century property which is unique by way of its architectural design in this location. The size and scale of the property are similar to those found in the CA and are a continuation of its character. The front elevation appears to be unaltered and hosts a shallow pitched roof which is unique to the street scene. This form contributes to the significance of the building as a non-designated heritage asset.

6. The proposal would raise the roof height of the dwelling and this would be visible from the public realm. Despite this increase in height, the roof would have a similar appearance to the existing roof structure to the front elevation and would be of a similar height to other buildings in the vicinity which are three stories in height. I do not find that this change would be immediately noticeable or appear incongruous to the front elevation.
7. To the rear of the building the proposed development would also involve the removal of a chimney and creation of two large gables. The gables would result in large additions where gables are not a feature of the host dwelling. The rear chimney stack is a tall feature of the roofscape. Its removal, and the addition of these large gables would, therefore, change the character of the appeal property. A large contemporary window would also be introduced between the two proposed rear gables thereby adding a modern feature that would be at odds with the traditional character of the existing building.
8. While there would be restricted visibility of the rear additions from the adjacent CA and whilst the scheme would re-instate lost details to the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling, these considerations would not alleviate the harm identified above. These would be small details which would not overcome the harm of the creation of two large gables to the rear of the host dwelling. Moreover, the raising of the roof and the changes proposed to its form would not complement the existing form of the roof and the character of the locally listed building. This proposal would lead to a dominant feature in the roofscape which would therefore harm the significance of the locally listed building and the setting of the CA.
9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would be harmful to the effect on the character and appearance on the host building and the CA. The harm to the CA would conflict with the guidance found in the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'). No public benefits associated with the scheme have been put forward to outweigh this harm, nor is it apparent that any such benefits of significance would be delivered.
10. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (LP). These policies seek to ensure that development respects the local character, makes a positive contribution to its context, conserve and enhance the character and significance of the historic environment and consists of high-quality details and materials which respect the local character.

### **Other Matters**

11. I note that a comment has been received from an interested party which notes that they have no concern with the design of the proposed development. However, this does not alter my findings on the main issue discussed above.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

*J Smith*

INSPECTOR