
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by Jonathan Tudor BA (Hons), Solicitor (non-practising)

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

Decision date: 15 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/16/3156071

19 Drayton Road, Leytonstone, London E11 4AR

- 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 Altaf Yakub against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 161205, dated 24 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is construction of mansard roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of the development contained in section E of the appeal form and the Council's decision notice, as it more simply describes the proposal than the wording on the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property stands on the west side of Drayton Road in a residential area. It gives the appearance of a semi-detached property mirroring the dwelling at 21 Drayton Road. However, it is also now attached to the other later properties on its northern side. A parapet to the front conceals a classic 'London' or 'butterfly' roof.
5. The proposed mansard roof extension would rise well above the existing parapet. Though it would be set back slightly and the roof would slope, the two dormer windows would project outwards vertically. Its bulk, scale and design would appear prominent and incongruous perched above the existing attractive façade. It would also create a visual imbalance with the twin dwelling at No 21 and disrupt the harmonious skyline created by the seamless parapet, with matching detail, which runs across Nos 19 and 21.
6. Whilst there are many houses along the road with pitched roofs and two blocks of modern flats, I did not see similar mansard roofs in the immediate area. I did note a limited number of dormer windows, mainly single ones, on a nearby road but not above parapets. Though the appellant refers to similar mansard

roofs on adjoining properties and in surrounding roads, no specific details or examples have been given. The Council Officer's report also states that there are no mansards in close proximity to the appeal site. Therefore, I do not consider that they are characteristic of the immediate area.

7. Furthermore, the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)¹ explicitly states that: '*Mansard roofs are not a typical or characteristic roof profile in the borough and it is therefore unlikely that this type of extension will be appropriate.*' The guidance does qualify that by stating that all applications will be considered on a case by case basis and that in some locations such proposals may be acceptable. However, in this case, though sympathetic external materials would be used, the structure would still appear prominent from the road, strike a discordant note and have an adverse impact on the immediate street scene.
8. The above factors lead me to conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and the area. It follows that it would conflict with Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy² and Policies DM4 and DM29 of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan³ as well as the SPD. They, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is well designed; responds positively to local context and character and that extensions relate to the original host building and respect the street scene and character of the area.

Other Matters

9. In addition to the main issue already discussed, concerns have been expressed about the effect that the development would have on privacy and sunlight in respect of a property to the rear. However, I note that the Council did not find that the effect would be significant. In any event, I have dismissed the appeal on other grounds.

Conclusion

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

Jonathan Tudor

INSPECTOR

¹ Adopted February 2010

² Adopted March 2012

³ Adopted October 2013