



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2017

by D J Board BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/W/17/3169281

107A Maynard Road, Walthamstow, E17 9JE

- 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 Mrs Angela Merino-Martin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 162622, dated 3 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (a) the character and appearance of the existing building and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of 105 Maynard Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The extension would maximise the width of the existing plot and would have a maximum depth of about 6m. It would be treated with a flat roof and I appreciate it would be constructed from brick that would match the existing dwelling. Nevertheless it would be wider than the existing house. Furthermore, the existing building has a strong pitch roof form and outrigger. The large flat roof addition would clash awkwardly with this. As a result it would appear incongruous and would not be subservient.
4. Therefore, whilst I note views of the addition from the street would be limited, it would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building. It would be in conflict with Core Strategy (CS) policy CS15 and policies DM4 and DM29 of the Local Plan Development Management Policies (DMP) which amongst other things require extensions to residential buildings to relate well to the original building and respect the character of the area.

Living conditions

5. The extension would project beyond the existing rear wall of the property. It would also extend in to the area to the side of the dwelling. The plans show that adjacent to No 105 the depth would be about 4m and have a height of about 3m. There is an existing fence on the common boundary.

6. No 105 has an existing rear addition which is described as a 'sun lounge' addition to the back of the house. A side window for this is visible above the existing fence. A considerable proportion of the extension would be visible above the existing fence on the common boundary. This would be over a depth of about 4m and it would potentially entirely block the side window to the sun lounge at No 105. As a consequence it would have an overbearing presence which would create an oppressive sense of enclosure.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 105 Maynard Road, with particular regard to outlook. It would be in conflict with policy DM4 of the DMP and CS policy CS15 which amongst other things seek to protect the occupiers of existing buildings. It would also conflict with a core principle of the Framework that seeks a high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D J Board

INSPECTOR