

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2016

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 May 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/16/3145774

104 Mansfield Hill, Chingford, London E4 7JT

- 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 Lee Herring against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 153393 was refused by notice dated 18 December 2015.
 - The development proposed is a side extension with a loft conversion and a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the local area.

Reasons

3. 104 Mansfield Hill is a low, semi-detached bungalow with a hipped roof, sitting on a large corner plot at the end of a row of similar bungalows. Mansfield Hill and the other adjacent street, College Gardens, are pleasant, tree lined residential streets. The proposal is made up of 3 elements: (i) a pitched roof over an area of flat roof at the back; (ii) a side extension including a gable instead of a hip; and (iii) a large box dormer that would stretch almost the full width of the roof at the back, including the roof of the proposed side extension.
 4. The Council raises no specific objection the first of these, the new pitched roof at the back. This would be a minor improvement. The Council's concern is about the visual impact of the other elements.
 5. There is plenty of room at the side of the existing bungalow to accommodate the proposed side extension without crowding the site. Although this would be long, it would also be low in height and partly screened by the existing boundary fence and hedge. The footprint on this extension is therefore generally acceptable.
 6. The combination of the new gable with an elongated box dormer construction would, however, create an excessively bulky and awkward extension, dominating the roof of the building as seen from the side and rear. It would be highly prominent in views from the side street, College Gardens. I note that
-

the dormer structure would be set down from the ridge, set back from the sides of the roof and set back from the eaves. Although this generally complies with the requirements set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), *Residential Extensions and Alterations*, the SPD also advises that dormer extensions should be of appropriate proportions. The proposed new roof structure would be out of scale and character with the building.

7. I have looked at the other examples of extensions in the local area drawn to my attention by the appellant. None of these appear to be directly comparable. None include such a large dormer construction in such a prominent corner position. I have considered this case on its own merits.
8. I conclude that due to the proposed roof alterations the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the building and the local area. It therefore conflicts with the relevant aims of Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy, Policy DM29 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan and the SPD, to ensure that development is of a high standard of design that reinforces local character and distinctiveness.
9. I recognise the appellant's reasonable wish to extend this family home. Nevertheless, for the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR