
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Mike Hayden BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/17/3175514

14 Richmond Crescent, Chingford, London E4 9RU

- 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 Ms Charlotte Little against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 170681, dated 22 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the adjoining terrace and on the overall street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace house, with an attractively detailed, full height gabled bay window and timber porch. It is located on the eastern side of Richmond Crescent within a section of the street which is characterised by a series of symmetrically designed and proportioned groups of terraced properties, with similar features to the appeal property. Each group is separated by a pair of single storey, linked garages, which are set back by around 1 metre from the front wall of the houses, subordinate to the main frontage, creating a series of intermittent gaps which serve to break up the length of the terrace. Overall, the combination of design features, the symmetry of the architecture and the regular visual breaks created by the garages give a pleasant uniformity and rhythm to the street scene on this side of Richmond Crescent, which is important to the character and appearance of the area.
4. Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) (the CS) and Policy DM29 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies (2013) (the DMP) expect new development to respond positively to and reinforce local character and distinctiveness. This is supported by paragraph 58 of the Framework. Policy DM4 of the DMP expects residential extensions to relate to the 'host' building and respect the street scene. To this end, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Extensions and

Alterations (2010) (the SPD) specifies a general rule that side extensions should be set back 1 metre from the main building line to remain subordinate. It also states a general presumption against front extensions, but that if they are proposed they should appear as if they were designed with the original building and should not look out of place in the street.

5. The proposed single storey extension would be to the front of the garage and to the side of the main house on the appeal property. Although small scale, it would bring the garage forward almost in line with the front wall of house, largely removing the set back at ground floor level, contrary to the guidance in the SPD. I note the proposed use of matching brickwork and the suggestion that render could be used to reflect the appearance of the adjoining garage at no. 12. However, the plans also show a slightly raised parapet wall and the introduction of a window that would rise above the header of the adjacent garage door and below the sill of the bay window to the house. These details would fail to match the symmetrical proportions of the frontages to the host dwelling and the adjoining terrace. Together, the loss of the set back and the design of the extension would create an unsympathetic addition to the host dwelling and the terrace which would look out of place. It would interrupt the overall rhythm of the architecture of the terraced groups and harm the uniformity of the street scene on the eastern side of Richmond Crescent.
6. I have been referred to a number of alterations and infill extensions to other properties in Richmond Crescent and Richmond Avenue. The full details of each scheme and the basis for these decisions have not been provided, although I noted that in many cases the set-back was less pronounced or the alterations formed part of a joint infill scheme between properties. It is a core principle of the planning system that each application is determined on its own merits and none of the examples given sets an irresistible precedent for the appeal scheme.
7. In this case, it is the particular context of the appeal site that leads me to conclude that the proposed extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and adjoining terrace and to the overall street scene. Accordingly, I find that it would be contrary Policy CS15 of the CS and Policies DM4 and DM29 of the DMP. Consequently, it would also fail to comply with paragraph 58 of the Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Hayden

INSPECTOR