
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2017

by Helen Cassini BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/16/3164822
13 Knotts Green Road, Leyton E10 6DD

- 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 Saving Energy Ltd for Family Mosaic Housing Association against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 163064, dated 16 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is external wall insulation to front and back elevation. 90mm EPS system to be applied to all external areas and finished in a silicon render finish – off white in colour (sample provided).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey terraced dwelling located on the southern side of Knotts Green Road. The front of the dwelling is brick faced, whilst the rear elevation is pebble-dashed. I consider that the detailing surrounding the bay windows and porch are unifying features of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The simple form, repetition and architectural detailing make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of both the appeal dwelling and wider area.
 5. There are a range of brick, rendered and pebble-dashed dwellings in the immediate local area. In addition, it was evident from my observations made
-

during my site visit that some dwellings on the street have undergone external alterations to their front elevations.

6. The proposal would extend the elevations of the host dwelling forward by approximately 9 centimetres. As such, the external surface of the front and rear elevations would be raised, which would alter the proportions of the dwelling, for example, by increasing the depth of the windows reveals and cills.
7. As such, whilst I consider that the external wall insulation would be of a relative depth, I do not find that it would be substantially visually different to a normal render finish. Although on close view the depth of the insulation would be visible, I do not consider that this would result in significant material harm to either the host dwelling or the surrounding area.
8. Nonetheless, there is no indication as to how the insulation would be applied with regard to the bay windows and porch. I therefore consider that the application provides inadequate information in relation to the front elevation of the dwelling. As such, I am not satisfied that the proposal would not overwhelm the existing detailing on the front elevation and would therefore materially detract from the character and appearance of both the dwelling and the surrounding area.
9. I understand the benefits of upgrading the insulation values of outside walls of the host dwelling. However, in the absence of detailed evidence I consider that any benefits that may arise would be heavily outweighed by the harm caused to the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. The National Planning Policy Framework cautions against the imposition of architectural styles and tastes; however it indicates that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
10. Accordingly, I find that the proposal fails to have regard to the distinctive character of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies CS2 and CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 (the CS) and Policies DM4 and DM29 of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013. When taken together these policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development and alterations are designed to protect and enhance the existing character of the built environment.
11. The Council has also referred to Policy CS13 of the CS in the decision notice. However, this policy is primarily concerned with the promotion of health and well-being within communities. As this policy does not make specific reference to the design of proposals, I do not consider it is of relevance in this instance.

Conclusion

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

Helen Cassini

INSPECTOR