
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by David L Morgan BA MA (T&CP) MA (Bld Con IoAAS) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 27th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/17/3167201

40 Clarendon Road, Walthamstow, Waltham Forest, London E17 9AZ

- 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 Louis Mason against the decision of Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 163821, dated 22 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is new loft space incorporated in new higher steeper pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted is new loft space incorporated in new higher steeper pitched roof at 40 Clarendon Road, London E17 9AZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 163821, dated 2 December 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 E/40/1, E/40/4, 4, 11, E/40/2, E/40/3, P40/1 & Street View received on 18th November 2016.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural matters

2. These proposals have been submitted in conjunction with those very similar to that submitted for the next door property, No 38 Clarendon Road. These proposals are also the subject of a parallel appeal¹. However, rather than formally link them, because of the different appellants and the different wording of the development proposed, I have determined the two appeals as separate entities. However, because of their co-terminus nature, the similarity of their visual attributes and the very close similarity of their effects, the reasoning in both appeals considers their joint or cumulative effect.
3. The descriptions of development for the mansard roofs proposed in both appeals differ. They are both taken, as convention requires, from the initial

¹ Appeal ref: APPU5930/D/17/3167258.

planning application forms. The one set out above does not expressly refer to a mansard roof, though it is clearly evident from the contents of the application and appeal drawings that this is what is in fact proposed. For the avoidance of doubt, notwithstanding the description above, this is the basis on which I have determined this appeal.

Main Issue

4. This is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal building and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. Clarendon Road is a lengthy residential avenue most likely dating from the later C19, though given the eclectic mix of house types along its length it looks to have been developed piecemeal over a period of years. This is reflected in the mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced housing that make it up. Within these different house types there is also a considerable variety of style, detailing and materials. In turn a wide variety of roof forms and types feed this visual diversity, with conventional street-facing pitches, gables, canted bay windows, serried ranks of dormers and indeed a pair of mansard extensions on dwellings at the western end of the road. A further layer of variety is added by the differing ridge and eaves heights of the respective house types which, interspersed with chimney stacks of differing forms and size, creates a roofscape of subtle variety and distinctive local character.
6. The appeal properties, probably of early or mid C20 date and, although of the same build, are asymmetric in proportion. No. 38 is of two bays whilst No. 40 is of three, possibly extended as such. The common roof is of a notably slack pitch and the eaves of No. 38 are significantly lower than that of No. 36, the dwelling terminating the terrace to the east.
7. The twin proposals are for a mansard roof extension across the front elevation with a flat roofed dormer to the rear. Although the elevations are not explicit, the 'street view' perspective drawing clearly illustrates the 'knee' of the mansard on the front elevation conjoining with the height of the eaves of the adjacent No. 36 with the upper pitch then following the line of the main pitch of No.36.
8. In a good many other scenarios within Clarendon Road I would share the Council's concerns over the effect of a twin mansard roof on the character of the area, indeed, those such additions to Nos 59 and 61 to the west serve to illustrate this point.
9. However, in the case of Nos 38 and 40, as the 'street view' drawing makes clear, here the profile of the mansard can be fully accommodated within the profile of the exposed element of the gable of No. 36, with the upper pitch in fact extending the plane of the front pitch of No. 36. This has the effect of integrating the appeal properties with the profile of the adjacent terrace without being seen to materially disrupt the wider form of the roofscape. Whilst there would be a more distinctive contrast with No. 42 to the west, this is a detached dwelling of markedly different character allowing this contrast in heights to be tolerated without adverse effect on character or appearance to the host buildings, nor that of the locality.

10. The proposals for the rear are set into the main roof profile and behind a series of later deep extensions to the properties. There would similarly be no harm to local character and appearance, nor indeed any other harm caused.
11. On this basis therefore, I find no conflict with policies CS2 and SC15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy 2012, which both seek to improve housing quality and deliver quality design, nor with policies DM4, DM29 and DM32 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies 2013 or with the guidance set out in the adopted Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2010 all of which also seek to secure these objectives.

Conditions

12. The appeal being allowed I attach a condition requiring that materials used in the development (in accordance with the details set out in the planning application form) match those of the existing to safeguard the character and appearance of the host building and local area. I also attach a condition requiring that the development be carried out in strict accordance with the approved plans (including that titled 'street view') to assure certainty that the development will be constructed as proposed therein.
13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Morgan

Inspector