



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3359396

64 Grosvenor Road, Wanstead, Redbridge, London E11 2ES

- 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 Mr Keith Ball against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref is 2469/24
 - The development proposed is the removal of chimney stack on rear elevation. Loft conversion with a rear dormer and rooflight. Hip to gable roof alterations. Alterations to first floor rear elevation. Three front roof lights, one rear rooflight and one side window in the proposed gable.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Subsequent to the Council's decision, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) (the Framework). I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issues in this appeal. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my decision with regard to the revised Framework.
3. Also subsequent to the Council's decision the Wanstead Grove Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2025) (the CAAMP) has been adopted. This was at the Draft for Public Consultation stage at the time of the decision and has now been adopted in full. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my decision with regard to the CAAMP as adopted.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the semi-detached pair of which it forms part and that of the local area, with reference to the Wanstead Grove Conservation Area (the CA)

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached house. It is located in a street predominantly fronted by semi-detached and terraced properties, generously set back from the street. These exhibit a variety of late 19th and early 20th Century architectural expressions with a mix of substantially original hipped and gable roof forms to terraces and pairs of semi-detached houses. These, including the appeal

- dwelling and its semi-detached pair, appear to have survived with only very limited alteration and /or extension to their fronts.
6. Consequently, the houses in the street present largely unaltered and coherent frontages, which result in a high quality streetscape that contributes to the established character and appearance of the wider mainly residential area. The significance of which, as a heritage asset, has been recognised by the Council through the designation of the CA.
 7. The CAAMP clarifies that the significance of the CA rests substantially in it being a well-preserved area of late Victorian and Edwardian suburban housing, which represents an important stage in the development of Wanstead from a country village to a middle-class London suburb, with the largely unchanged forms and details of the houses resulting in an attractive and verdant suburban area. The CAAMP identifies the appeal dwelling as being a positive contributor to the character or appearance of the CA.
 8. In line with the duty imposed on me by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have given considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
 9. The proposal includes a hip to gable alteration to enable the construction of a rear dormer extension, which would also require the removal of the existing rear chimney stack. The proposed rear dormer extension would be set down from the ridge of the extended roof and up from the eaves and would be set well in from the roof edge and party wall upstand.
 10. The appellant has stated that the design of the proposal is intended to overcome the reasons given for a split decision in a previous appeal¹. This dismissed the addition of a proposed rear dormer and side dormer, without a change from a hipped to gable roof form, on the basis of harm to the character and appearance of the CA and the appeal dwelling. The allowed element in the split decision was a single storey rear extension that has been implemented.
 11. Whilst the CAAMP identifies that some properties in the CA have had hip-to gable alterations to accommodate roof extensions, this is not the case for the appeal dwelling and its semi-detached pair and both have hipped roof forms. These form part of a cohesive group of 3 semi-detached pairs that all have hipped roofs and all are recognised as making a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
 12. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of hip to gable extensions in the local area, including those allowed on appeal, as well as to approved hip to gable extensions that have not been implemented. The implemented ones vary in age and form part of the existing wider physical context to the proposal, as well as to other approvals that have been unimplemented. However, these all vary significantly to the appeal dwelling and context, in that they are either end of terrace properties, approvals for hip to gable for both houses in a semi-detached pair, albeit without a requirement to be implemented in tandem, or with markedly different architectural form and heritage/group value. These examples also vary significantly from the appeal proposal in their immediate context with regard to the prevalence of earlier hip to gable alterations within their street. As such, I find that

¹ APP/W5780/D/19/3238650

they do not form the basis for direct comparison or as exemplars for the appeal proposal. These would have been considered on their own individual merits, and I have done likewise in my consideration of the proposal, which is a main tenet of the planning system. I have therefore afforded these limited weight in my considerations

13. Further, heritage planning and practice develops over time, and from my site visit, there is an evident detrimental effect of earlier examples of hip to gable extensions on the character and appearance of their host properties and the significance of the CA as defined by the CAAMP, particularly where these involve semi-detached houses. As such these changes, whilst within the CA do not accord with its significance as set out in the CAAMP, which also recognises the harm of such changes to the character and appearance of the CA.
14. The proposed change to a gable end would result in a significant change of roof massing from the current hipped form, generating addition bulk at roof level. There is an existing short parapet upstand on the flank side of the roof of the appeal dwelling and a substantial original feature gable to the appeal dwelling, which hips into the current roof form and matches that of its semi-detached pair. However, these reflect the original design of the semi-detached pair and, as such would neither screen or constitute relevant and appropriate design cues for the proposal. Rather, the massing of the proposed additional bulk of the proposed gable roof form would result in a visual imbalance with its semi-detached pair and also would appear as incongruous in relation to the group of hipped roof semi-detached houses of which it forms part.
15. Although the design of the proposed dormer would appear to accord with the general guidance for dormers to existing roof as set in the Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) (the SPD), its proposed bulk and massing would only be possible with the proposed change from the existing hipped to a gabled roof form. It is the excess scale and bulk of the design of the proposed roof extension, when considered as a whole, that would result in visual imbalance and be detrimental to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, its semi-detached pair and the group of 3 semi-detached pairs of houses of which it forms part. I note that the inspector for the previous dismissed appeal also came to a similar conclusion regarding imbalance that would result from rear and side dormers, without a change from a hipped to gable roof form.
16. Consequently, I find that the proposal does not accord with the guidance for roof extensions given in Section 3.7 of the SPD, which advises that any roof alterations are subordinate in size to the roof of the house and do not appear as a dominant feature and that hipped to gable extensions will generally be refused permission where this would be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area, or harm the symmetry of a pair of semi-detached properties.
17. The detrimental effect of the proposal on the character of the appeal dwelling, its semidetached pair and the group of 3 semi-detached pairs of houses, would also be evident in wider views from the street and surrounding properties. Consequently, the visual imbalance that would result from the additional bulk of the proposal would detract from the contribution the appeal dwelling makes to the significance of the CA, thereby failing to preserve that significance.

18. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposed development, when considered as a whole, would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area, thereby failing to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This would be contrary to Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018), HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and Sections 12 and 16 of the Framework. Collectively these seek to ensure that development is of high design quality, responds to local character and context, is compatible with the existing area character and patterns of development and preserves or enhances the appearance or character of conservation areas.
19. The appellant has stated that the proposal would provide the benefits of reverting to the original plain tiles from the current concrete tiles, replacing windows to match existing original windows, as well as negating the need to repair the existing flank parapet upstand. However, the benefits of improving the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the CA, through reverting to original materials and design in the manner proposed, are not uniquely dependant on the approval and implementation of the proposal. Accordingly, I have only afforded this minimal weight in my considerations.
20. The proposed hip to gable alteration and rear dormer extension would provide additional living space, benefiting existing and future occupiers, however, this does not constitute significant public benefit.

Conclusion

21. The harm I have identified, including the less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA, significantly outweighs the potential benefits of the proposal. The appeal is dismissed accordingly.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR