



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2012

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 September 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/12/2180145

1A Hereford Road, Wanstead, London E11 2EA

- 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 Mark Redgrave against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 0564/12, dated 15 March 2012, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2012.
 - The development proposed is proposed loft extension and new roof, new doors to garden from kitchen, extend bathroom over porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The appeal site is within the Wanstead Grove Conservation Area and I have had regard to the fact that section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. This is reflected in Strategic Policy 3¹ and Policy E3².
3. The area comprises mainly attractive Edwardian houses and whilst most in Hereford Road are semi-detached, No 1A is detached and is of a different style incorporating a flat roofed element to the side. The appellant has pointed out various alterations and dormer window extensions that have been added to dwellings in the area. I have no major concerns about the proposed extension to the bathroom and the new doors to the kitchen would be a minor alteration.
4. However, the alterations to the roof are unacceptable when viewed from the street. This would conflict with Policy BD5³ which establishes that planning permission will only be granted for extensions to existing residential properties

¹ London Borough of Redbridge Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document March 2008.

² London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document May 2008.

³ London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document May 2008.

where, amongst other things, they complement the character of the building and incorporate a roof profile sympathetic to the existing dwelling.

5. The position of No 1A means that the side of the house is very visible when looking north-eastwards up Hereford Road. The proposed large asymmetrical design to the altered roof would appear prominent, awkward and out of place in the street scene. This large and bulky design would be out of keeping with the general character of the area and totally fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Wanstead Grove Conservation Area contrary to Strategic Policy 3 and Policy E3.
6. I appreciate that the proposal would add extra space to the house without extending its footprint. I also note that the appellant proposes to use materials to reflect the appearance of others in the area. The appellant quotes the National Planning Policy Framework and I accept that this would be a sustainable development but the design of this proposal is not a good standard and it would cause material harm to a heritage asset i.e. the Conservation Area. Therefore, I do not consider that the benefits of the proposal to the appellant outweigh that harm⁴.
7. I have taken all other matters raised into consideration including the potential effect on the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings but none alters my conclusion. I conclude that the proposal, in terms of the roof alteration, would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

⁴ Paragraph 65 of the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012.