



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3360800

112 Wanstead Park Avenue, Wanstead, London E12 5EF

- 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 Jonathan Bonnick and Charlene Irvine against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 3205/24.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with a rear facing dormer and three roof windows in the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Aldersbrook and Lake House Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey terraced house. It forms part of a short terrace of 4 houses that would have originally been identical and still retain a large degree of uniformity. The terrace forms part of a residential street comprising terraces of similar appearance and massing but with varied levels of decoration. This pattern of development is evident in the surrounding streets giving the area a high degree of uniformity and coherence. This, and the quality of housing in the area, contribute positively to the Aldersbrook and Lake House Conservation Area (CA) which is a classic Edwardian suburb described in the Council's Aldersbrook Conservation Area and Lake House Estate Appraisal (2020) as exemplifying the blending of mass-produced, pattern book housing and artisanal craftsmanship typical of middleclass homes.
4. The rear slope of the roof of the terrace of which the appeal property forms part includes a pair of dormers at No. 108. Whilst these disrupt the unity of the terrace, they are relatively modest in size. By contrast the appeal proposal would comprise the erection of a single flat-roofed dormer which would occupy most of the rear roof slope of the appeal property. Due to its siting, size and boxy appearance this would be an overly dominant and incongruous addition that would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and would fail to preserve the appearance of the CA.

5. The harm to this heritage asset would be less than substantial. In these circumstances Paragraph 215 of the Framework requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. As the proposal simply provides extra private space for the occupiers of the appeal property there would be no public benefits arising from it.
6. For the reasons set out above the proposal is contrary to Policies LP26, LP30, and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) which require development to be well-designed and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas. There is also conflict with the aims of the Aldersbrook Conservation Area and Lake House Estate Design Guide (2020) and the Council's Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) which advises that oversized dormers will be refused.
7. I note that there are some large boxy dormers on the rear roof slopes of a number of houses in the wider area. However, this is not the prevailing character of the visual context of the appeal property and, as each planning application needs to be considered on its individual merits having regard to its locality, I attribute limited weight to the "precedents" referred to by the appellant, many of which illustrate the clear harm that can result from overly large roof additions.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR