
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2016

by R W Allen B.Sc PGDip MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/16/3163212
51 Waverley Road, Walthamstow, E17 3LG

- 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 Family Mosaic Housing Association against the decision of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 162192, dated 5 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is external wall insulation to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for external wall insulation to front and rear at 51 Waverley Road, Walthamstow, E17 3LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 162192, dated 5 July 2016 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development shall take place until details of both the materials to be used for the external wall insulation; and the architectural detailing to be reinstated to the doors and windows on the front elevation of the dwelling have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey mid-terraced dwelling. It is set amongst similar properties in terms of form and size, although differences can be seen in their appearance by the varying use of bay window designs and first floor gabled roof features, and the range of elevation treatments such as exposed brick, render, and pebble dash. Notwithstanding, I observed a commonality of decorative architectural detailing to front doors and windows, which I find contributes strongly and positively to the character and appearance of the street.
4. The proposed development would involve adding a layer of insulation to the facades of the building to improve its thermal performance. The Council raises

no specific concerns with the principle of this, or with the effects of the proposed development caused from the rear elevation of the building. I have no reason to disagree.

5. The proposed insulation would not be particularly deep, and would not in my judgement unduly or notably accentuate the dwelling to cause it to appear uneven when juxtaposed with neighbouring dwellings. The submitted drawings show, and confirmed by the Council, that the architectural detailing of the dwelling would be replicated and reinstated as existing by the use of model casts. This I find would be necessary to ensure that the dwelling would continue to reflect and harmonise with the character of the street. I am satisfied that the imposition a planning condition would ensure this would be carried out appropriately, and I see no obvious reason why the condition could not safeguard the profile of the detailing surrounding the gabled roof.
6. I therefore find that the proposed development would accord with policies CS2 and CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) and with policy DM29 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies 2013 (DMP). These state that the Council will facilitate sustainable housing growth by requiring high quality architecture and urban design to ensure it makes a positive contribution to improving the urban environment in the borough, and give strong recognition to local distinctiveness. It would also accord with DMP policy DM4, which states that the Council will expect extensions to residential buildings to relate to the original host building and respect the street scene and character of the area. As Core Strategy policy CS13 relates to the creation of healthy and sustainable places, and because the scheme was refused on matters relating to design and appearance, I do not find the policy is particularly relevant to the appeal.

Conditions

7. I have noted the Council's suggested condition wording in respect to the works complying with a document entitled '*The Buildlite Brochure*'. However, this document is not before me, and I cannot be sure of its requirements or whether the Council's suggested wording is sufficiently precise or reasonable. I have therefore amended the wording to require details of the materials, and of the reinstatement of the existing architectural features, to be approved by the Council before development commences. This would meet the tests of paragraph 206 of the Framework and would allow the Council to ensure the proposed development would be carried out appropriately.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Allen

INSPECTOR