

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2017

by G Rollings BA(Hons) MA(UD) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/17/3168888

84 Vansittart Road, Forest Gate, E7 0AA

- 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 Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 163689, dated 10 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is external wall insulation to the front and back elevations; 90mm EPS system to be applied to external walls and finished in a silicon render finish, off white in colour.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for external wall insulation to the front and back elevations, being a 90mm EPS system to be applied to external walls and finished in a silicon render finish, and white in colour, at 84 Vansittart Road, Forest Gate, E7 0AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 163689, dated 10 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Site location plan; Plan view; Elevation drawing.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey, mid-terraced dwelling. Its front and rear façades are of brick construction, with differentiated brick ornamentation above its front-facing first-floor windows and front door. It is located within a street of similar terraced dwellings, and although their specific designs change every few dwellings or so, the overall visual impression of the street is one of uniformity.
 4. The buildings within the terrace of the appeal dwelling have brick façades, with the exception of ground-floor render on the corner building at 90 Vansittart Road. Conversely, buildings on the opposite side of the road to the appeal site, which
-

have a similar form, are predominantly rendered over both storeys, or have their brickwork overpainted in a light colour. This is replicated on both sides of the road away from the appeal site. The appearances of the rendered buildings vary due to the materials and colours used, and as such, there is a wide variation in appearances along the length of the street. However, despite these differences, dwellings on the street retain a homogenous architectural form, and variations in their façades do not generally appear out of place within the wider street scene.

5. With the exception of the corner dwelling at No. 90, the six dwellings within the appeal terrace have their street facing brickwork visible. The buildings at 86 and 88 Vansittart Road have a slightly different appearance to the appeal dwelling, which No. 86 adjoins. The four remaining buildings in the terrace have minor variations between their appearances, which have developed over time as a result of replacement of boundary fences, windows and doors, and overall maintenance. Although the addition of insulation to the appeal dwelling would alter its appearance, it would be in character with the existing variation in façade treatments along the length of the street, and there would be no harm to the overall street scene. The appearance of the terrace would also be altered, but any detrimental visual impact would be limited to the appearance of the terrace. Given that the appeal proposal would not cause the building to appear obtrusive, incongruous or out of character with its surroundings, I consider such impact to be minimal and resulting in limited harm.
6. I have also considered the likely effects of the proposed alterations to the appeal dwelling's rear elevation, and note that there is a greater variation between dwellings than on their front façades. Other rendered rear elevations are visible from the appeal site, and the addition of render to the building would not result in insignificant visual harm.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling or area. There would be no conflict with the Council's *Core Strategy* (2012) Policies CS2, CS13 and CS15, nor its *Development Management Policies* (2013) DM 4 and DM29, which together require development, including residential alterations, to be appropriate within their context and contribute to local distinctiveness.

Conditions and conclusion

8. The Council has specified conditions which I have considered in light of the tests set out in the PPG. Condition 2 is required in the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt, and to ensure that the development is built in accordance with the approved plans. The Council requested a condition that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development should match those used in the existing building. However, given that the materials hereby permitted would alter the appearance of the dwelling and have already been identified as being different to its existing materials, this condition is unnecessary and it has not been applied.
9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR