

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/17/3170569

72 Brook Crescent, London, E4 9ET

- 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 Ali Nizam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 164040, dated 13 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a part single- and part two-storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the area around Brook Crescent.

Reasons

3. No 72 is an end-terraced house, situated on the northern side of Brook Crescent. In common with other houses in the vicinity it has a large front bay feature. There is an unsurfaced access lane to the side of the house which leads to a short access lane that runs to the rear of Nos 70-80. There is a large detached outbuilding at the rear of the appeal property, possibly a garage, and an attached garage running along the side of the house. The house has a large, recently constructed dormer roof extension to the rear roof slope, which has involved a hip to gable alteration to the roof.
 4. The proposed extension would involve the construction of a two-storey side extension along the full depth of the side elevation, and a small single-storey rear extension across the western side of the house, behind the existing kitchen and the proposed side extension. The two-storey side extension would be built flush with the front and rear elevations and would follow the existing roof line at the front and the pitch of the original roof line at the rear. The ridge of the roof of the extension would be set down by around 300mm by virtue of a very small flat roof element at the highest point.
-

5. This part of Brook Crescent is characterised by short rows of terraced houses, chiefly with hipped roofs. There are gaps between the terraces of varying widths and a small number of end-terraced houses have two-storey extensions to the side. These include, in the vicinity of the appeal property, No 60, which has a flat-roofed extension, and No 50 which has an extension that continues the hipped roof of the original house. These would appear to have been constructed some time ago. No 53 opposite has a large side extension that creates a symmetrical double-fronted house with a continuation of the hipped roof. No 52, which is the other end house in the terrace that includes the appeal property, has a hip to gable extension. This accommodates a rear dormer that is set in from the side elevation, and which is not prominent in the street scene.
6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Extensions and Alterations (SPD) indicates that any side extension should not have an adverse impact on the established positive characteristics of the street scene. It goes on to indicate that as a general rule, a side extension should be subordinate to the main part of the house and set back from the main building line fronting the street by 1 metre. In this case, the proposed extension would continue the line of the existing front and back elevations. Furthermore, the dropping of a small section of the central portion of the ridge of the roof by only some 300mm would become an incongruous feature in the street scene. It would appear as a somewhat artificial attempt to reduce the overall height of the extension, and would effectively do nothing to assist in making it appear subordinate to the original house.
7. I note that the current proposal is a somewhat reduced version of an earlier larger scheme. However, the scale and height of the extension as viewed from the front and side, and as part of the street scene, would not appear subordinate and would dominate the original house. The prevailing character of Brook Crescent is one of modest houses with hipped roofs. I accept that No 60 has a gable end, but in this case the overall width of the house has not been extended and the rear dormer, being set in from the side elevation, appears subservient. The proposed development at No 72, with its extended width and full-depth gable end, would result in an overbearing appearance within the street scene, detrimental to its character.
8. In conclusion, I find that the proposed two-storey side extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of this part of Brook Crescent and would conflict with Policy DM29 of the Council's Development Management Policies Local Plan document, which requires that developments should respond to their context in terms of scale, height, and massing, and that they should reinforce and/or enhance local character and distinctiveness. It would also conflict with guidance in the SPD.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR

