
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2016

by A Napier BA(Hons) MRTPI MIEMA CEnv

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

Decision date: 30 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/16/3159952
7 Maida Avenue, Chingford, London E4 7JH

- 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 John Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 161543, dated 16 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is ground floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground floor front extension at 7 Maida Avenue, Chingford, London E4 7JH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 161543, dated 16 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan, 6414/2, 6414/3 and 6414/4.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is one of a number of similar two-storey semi-detached houses, which follow a regular pattern of linear development along both sides of Maida Avenue. However, whilst having a regular layout, there is some variation in the siting of properties, so that the extent of set back from the highway is not uniform. The dwellings within the road share a number of key features and characteristics, such as their overall scale, bay windows and use of a common palette of materials. Nonetheless, most of the dwellings within the road include a single-storey projection to the front elevation and the
-

individual approach taken to the scale and design of these elements results in a degree of variety in the form and appearance of these houses.

4. The appeal dwelling is set back some considerable distance from the highway and forms one of a small group of six houses that are sited significantly further back from the road than most neighbouring properties, including those opposite the site and many of those further along the street. In common with many of its neighbours, the appeal site includes parking provision and only relatively limited enclosure to its frontage, such that the front elevation of the dwelling is clearly visible from within the public realm.
5. An enclosed porch currently exists to the front of the house and the appeal proposal seeks to replace this with a materially larger extension. However, although larger, the proposal would be single-storey in form and its width would be approximately half that of the two-storey dwelling. Moreover, although the depth of the proposal would be considerably greater than that of the existing porch, I consider that this depth would not be excessive, given the relatively limited overall scale of the proposal in relation to that of the appeal dwelling, its siting in relation to the road and its setting within the area.
6. Accordingly, for these reasons, I find that the scale, mass and overall design of the proposal would represent a complementary and relatively modest addition to the property, which would not be disproportionate in relation to the appeal dwelling or visually dominate its front elevation. Furthermore, for similar reasons, I consider that the proposal would have an acceptable visual relationship with neighbouring properties and would not represent an incongruous or visually obtrusive form of development within the streetscene. In addition, the scale and design of the proposal would not be materially at odds with other similar extensions within the area.
7. Consequently, overall, I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be in accordance with the *Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy 2012* Policy CS15 and the *Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies 2013* Policies DM4 and DM29, where they collectively seek to protect local character and appearance. It would also meet the aims of paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework, to achieve high quality design and take account of the different roles and character of different areas.

Other matters

8. From the evidence before me and taking into account the scale, design and siting of the proposed extension relative to nearby properties, I am satisfied that the proposal would not have a significant impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
9. Reference has been made to officer advice about the likely depth of extension that the Council would consider acceptable. However, given my findings above, it is not necessary for me to consider this matter further.

Conditions and conclusions

10. The Council has not suggested any conditions in the event that I am minded to allow the appeal. However, I note that the walls of the appeal dwelling are currently painted render and the submitted details propose the use of brickwork for the proposal. Taking into account the context of the proposal

and the appearance of other similar extensions nearby, I consider that the use of an appropriate brick would be acceptable in this case. However, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to control the detail of the materials used and I intend to apply a condition to this effect. In addition, for certainty, it is necessary that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

11. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Napier

INSPECTOR