
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2017

by Stephen Roscoe BEng MSc CEng MICE

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

Decision date: 21 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/17/3179769
20 Simmons Lane, Chingford, London E4 6JH

- 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 Pawel Stasch against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 170236, dated 23 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a new porch at the front of an existing entrance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal development was under construction at the time of my site visit.

Reasons

3. I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the appeal development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached house which is situated on the inside of a slight bend on Simmons Lane. The appeal house is set forward of similar houses to the east along the road and appears to be set forward of those to the west as a result of the alignment of the road. Few of the houses along the road to the west of the appeal property have porches and only some to the east have them.
4. The appeal porch at the appeal dwelling is generally larger than those to the west and the east. It also includes a front overhang which is uncharacteristic of the other porches and houses along the road. In addition to these uncharacteristic attributes, the porch is situated in a more prominent location than others nearby due to the alignment of the road. Moreover, the size of the porch dominates the front elevation of the house.
5. The porch therefore does not relate to the original host building or respect the street scene or the character of the surrounding area, and it therefore conflicts with Development Management Policies¹ (DMP) Policy DM4. It also does not represent a high quality contribution to the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood, as required by Core Strategy² (CS) Policy CS15.

¹ London Borough of Waltham Forest: Local Plan: Development Management Policies: October 2013

² London Borough of Waltham Forest: Local Plan: Core Strategy: March 2012

6. I recognise that various materials on the porch match, and would match, those found on the host dwelling. This compatibility does not, and would not, however outweigh the harm that I have identified.
7. I therefore conclude that the appeal development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. I further conclude that it conflicts with DMP Policy DM4 and CS Policy CS15.
8. I acknowledge that the size of the porch may be necessary to facilitate wheelchair access and access for those with disabilities through it. There is no evidence however to demonstrate that the porch is necessary for such access in the first instance, and this is therefore no reason to allow the appeal. In coming to this view, I have taken into account Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
9. Having taken into account all other matters raised, none carry sufficient weight to alter the decision, and my conclusion is based on the evidence before me in terms of policy as a whole. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Roscoe

INSPECTOR