The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2017

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/17/3171567
29 Hollywood Road, Chingford, London E4 8JE

- 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 George Panteli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
- The application Ref 163172, dated 26 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2016.
- The development proposed is first floor side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side extension at 29 Hollywood Road, Chingford, London E4 8JE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 163172, dated 26 September 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: LIVARCH/29HR/101A, LIVARCH/29HR/201A, LIVARCH/29HR/301A, LIVARCH/29HR/401, LIVARCH/29HR/501A and LIVARCH/29HR/601A.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The existing semi-detached house faces onto the turning circle at the end of a cul-de-sac of pleasant two-storey housing of a broadly similar architectural character and scale.

4. It is proposed to add a first floor to an existing single storey side extension with the requisite roof alterations to accommodate this. There would be no change to the footprint of the side addition and the extension would remain set back from the front wall of the main house. The new roof over the proposed extension, whilst raised in height to accommodate the first floor additions, would remain lower than, and set back from, the roof over the main house.

5. The additions would remain subsidiary in scale when compared to the bulk of the original main part of the dwelling and the design and materials would be

complimentary. Set back from the main front wall of the house, at a lower roof height and a subservient scale the first floor extension would not appear overly dominant nor give an unbalanced appearance to the semi-detached pair of dwellings. The proposal would therefore not appear incongruous or have a materially harmful impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, either in respect of the street scene or as viewed from neighbouring properties.

6. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) in the proposal responding positively to local context and character. The scheme would satisfy policies DM4 and DM29 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) by respecting the street scene and design character of the area and adhere with the guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document of February 2010.

Conclusion

7. In addition to the standard time limit for commencement a condition setting out the plans approved is required in the interests of certainty. Subject to these conditions, and for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR