



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/25/3366521

8 Raynes Avenue, Wanstead, London E11 2LS

- 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 Nazabid Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application ref. is 3076/24.
 - The development proposed is Demolish existing single storey bungalow, garage and shed. Replacement two-storey, seven-bedroom dwellinghouse with associated landscaping, car parking, cycle and refuse storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council changed the description of development at validation stage and the applicant raised no objection. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the description on the decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the Wanstead Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is within Wanstead Park CA. The statutory duty set out in section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
5. The appeal site is a rectangular plot containing a detached bungalow in brick with a clay tile hipped roof, an attached flat-roofed garage, which is built to the boundary, and a portico porch. There is a wooden shed in the rear garden, behind which is a golf course that forms part of the wider Wanstead Park.
6. Raynes Avenue comprises detached properties with hipped roofs set 6-8m back. No. 6 is also a bungalow, with eaves and two hipped dormers facing the right-hand side of the site as seen from the street. The rest are two-storey. No. 10, on the left, is built to the side passageway of the site. Opposite are rear gardens.
7. The side of Raynes Avenue on which the site is located and adjoining parts of Warren Road to the east are within the CA, the significance of which lies in its

origins as a deer park, later landscaped to form the setting of the now-demolished Wanstead House. A Tree Preservation Order applies to the area.

8. This part of the CA forms a built margin to the park, softened by garden and street trees. The bungalows, rear gardens opposite and large garden trees nearby create a spacious, secluded and verdant feel. It is common ground that the properties here, whilst good examples of 1950s houses, are of limited historic or architectural interest. I agree with the Council that they make a neutral contribution to the CA.
9. The proposal would replace the bungalow, garage, and shed with a two-storey house that nearly spans the plot, leaving about a metre to each side boundary. A single-storey front bay would extend 0.3m forward of the bay containing No.10's integral garage door, while the main house would sit 0.3m forward of No.10. It would have a hipped clay tile roof, with a hipped front dormer, two smaller rear dormers, a flat central 'crown' section, and rooflights on the sides.
10. The effect would be to create a building of significantly greater massing in what is a relatively low-density section of Raynes Avenue, sited at least as close to the street as nearby properties. Set behind trees on the edge of the golf course, it would not be much more visible from within the parkland part of the CA – for example, along the footpath extending south from Warren Road – but would effect a significant change to the parts of Raynes Avenue within or adjacent to the CA.
11. Whilst I note that Nos. 2 and 10 fill almost the entire widths of their plots, these have simpler and less bulky roof forms without dormers. I note also that they both have single storey front extensions, in their cases comprising bays over garage doors and porches. Alone, these are acceptable features, but in the case of the proposal, the position of the window bay forward of the adjacent properties would further impinge on the spaciousness to which the current set-back contributes.
12. Similarly, whilst Nos. 4 and 6 have front dormers, they are of more modest scale than proposed. Furthermore, no other property on Raynes Avenue has a 'crown' roof, which creates a greater sense of depth and volume than traditional, articulated roof forms with distinct elements and one or more valleys.
13. The proposal would replace a building that makes a neutral contribution to this part of the CA with one that would detract from its spacious, verdant feel, reducing the visibility of parkland trees. This would compromise the soft built margin to the park and diminish its significance as a landscape.
14. Overall, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA. This would be contrary to Policy HC1 of the London Plan and Policies LP26 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan, which require proposals to be sympathetic to the significance of heritage assets and their appreciation within their surroundings, to respect local character and to resist development that does not preserve the character of designated heritage assets. I attach significant weight to these policy conflicts.

Other Matters

15. The proposal would reduce the proportion of front garden that would be sealed or surfaced, and would provide a larger house, for which there is a greater need in the Borough. I attach modest weight to these benefits, which do not outweigh the harm I have found. In terms of housing delivery, there would be no net benefit.

Planning Balance

16. The 2023 Housing Delivery Test result for the Borough was 48% and it is common ground that, whilst improving, housing delivery remains substantially below the requirement. In these circumstances, footnote 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) establishes that the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date.
17. Therefore, permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect CAs provides a strong reason for refusing. As I have found that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Wanstead Park CA, paragraph 215 of the Framework requires this to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
18. The harm that I have found is not outweighed by the reduction of hard surface or the provision of a relatively greater-needed housing type. Furthermore, I attach considerable weight to the presumption that preservation is desirable. The harm therefore provides a strong reason for refusing. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR