



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2024

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3345101

4 Stoneycroft Road, Woodford Green, Redbridge IG8 8ED

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Jenny Tubetari against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref is 0278/24.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area, with reference to the Woodford Bridge Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey mid terrace Victorian house with small front area rear gardens. It is located in a part of the street predominantly fronted by similar properties. However, many of these, including the appeal dwelling have render or pebbledash front elevations, with a significant number of rear box dormer roof extensions evident. These interventions have weakened the common architectural characteristics and unaltered features that would have originally given strong architectural cohesion to the streetscape. The significance of the area as a heritage asset has been recognised by the Council through the designation of the CA in 2020.
4. The appeal dwelling falls within a character area of the CA that is recognised as an early phase of the area's suburban development. The Woodford Bridge Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2014) identifies the terraced properties in Stoneycroft Road, including the appeal dwelling, as of some historic interest and worthy of preserving. The CA is a heritage asset to which I have a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
5. The proposal is for a loft conversion that would involve the insertion of two roof lights to the front roof slope and the addition of a flat roofed rear box dormer

- extension to the rear roof slope, which would be clad in tiles to match the existing roof with two rear windows that generally reflect the scale and form of the existing rear windows to the property. The proposal would result in a larger house with additional living space, which is a significant private rather than public benefit.
6. The proposed extensions would align with the existing roof ridge and be set in approximately 0.3 metres in from the eaves and 0.6 metres from the party wall with 6 Stoneycroft Road (No.6). This does not accord with the design guidance for such extensions set out in the Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (the SPD). This sets out that such extensions should be symmetrically located, 0.5 metres below the roof ridge, 1 metre from the eaves and 1m in from shared boundaries.
 7. Whilst I recognise that the appeal dwelling is small in scale, the proposal does not reflect this scale or respond in its box design and asymmetrical location to the architectural expression of the appeal dwelling. Consequently, the proposed dormer extension would appear to dominate the appeal dwelling and to not appear as a secondary or subordinate addition.
 8. The appellant has drawn my attention to other properties in the immediate locality that I was able to see on my site visit. These are of varying age, and I have limited planning background on some, but the appellant has also provided me with examples of large and full width dormer extensions that accord with the permitted development allowances of the PPG. Whilst these do form part of the physical context to the proposal, the detrimental effect of these on the character and appearance of their host properties and the local area is evident.
 9. The proposal would be readily evident in rear views of the property from Waltham Road and in these views the scale, box like massing and asymmetrical positioning of the proposed extension would not reflect the pitched roofs to dwellings and outriggers to the rear of the dwellings in the terrace. As a result, the proposal would appear unduly prominent and dominating within the local streetscape. This would add to the existing detrimental effect I have identified that results from the existing box dormer extensions in the local area. Consequently, the proposal would fail to reflect the contribution that the appeal dwelling makes to the streetscape of this part of the CA and its significance as a heritage asset.
 10. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area, failing to preserve or enhance that of the CA. This would be contrary to Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018), Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). Collectively these seek to ensure that development is of high design quality, responds to local character and context and is compatible with the existing area character and patterns of development and preserves or enhances the appearance or character of conservation areas.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

11. Whilst the proposed dormer extension would provide additional living space, benefiting existing and future occupiers, this is not a substantial public benefit. In general, planning decisions should be made in the wider public interest. In

this context, the harm I have identified, including the less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA outweighs these benefits. Dismissing the appeal is a proportionate response in this instance.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR