

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2017

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/17/3178920

19 Sheredan Road, Chingford E4 9RW

- 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 Judi Leddy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 171006, dated 10 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension at 19 Sheredan Road, Chingford E4 9RW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 171006, dated 10 March 2017, 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: DPL.99; DPL.01; DPL.02; DPL.03; DPL.04; DPL.05; DPL.06; DPL.07 and DPL.08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Policies CS2 and CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (CS) and Policy DM4 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies (DMP) together seek to secure high quality design that responds positively to local context. In relation to residential extensions proposals will be expected to relate to the original 'host' building, respect the street scene and character of the area, retain and restore existing 'traditional' features where appropriate and protect the occupiers of existing and nearby buildings from suffering any excessive loss of residential amenity.
4. The appeal property is located on the inside of the junction of Sheredan Road and Nightingale Avenue. The proposed two storey extension would be situated

- on the side of the existing property, and extend to the back edge of the pavement on Nightingale Avenue.
5. The extension would not be set back from the front of the house, nor would the ridge line be set down from that of the main house, both identified in the Council's 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as measures set out as a 'general rule' regarding side extensions. However, the SPD recognises that there are exceptions to this approach within an overall aim of seeking to ensure that side extensions are sympathetically designed, their scale carefully considered and that any side extension should not have an adverse impact on the established positive characteristics of the street scene.
 6. The proposal would replicate existing features present on the host property. Bricks to match the existing would be utilised at ground floor on the front elevation of the existing, as a feature on the front corner at first floor and as a string course between ground and first floor levels. A rendered finish on the upper floor front elevation would carry over from the main house, with the curved two storey bay also replicated on the extension. These features, replicated within the proposed extension and present on the existing dwelling, are all features that are found extensively on nearby properties and which I saw to be key components in defining the area's prevailing character. In this respect, I find that the proposal would respond positively to local context, character, appearance and detailing.
 7. The Council's concern is expressed in terms of the size, scale, design and siting of the extension, the officer delegated report referring particularly to the width of the extension; in part because it would extend up to the back edge of the pavement on Nightingale Avenue, and in part because it would be more than 50% of the width of the existing dwelling. The appellant has not sought to challenge the extension's width as being more than 50%, but equally nor have the Council directed me to any policy or guidance that sets out such a figure. Instead, within the context of the development plan policies and the guidance set out in the SPD, I find that the extension would be a subordinate, well-proportioned and well-detailed extension that would respond successfully to the positive character and appearance traits of the existing dwelling, and of those around it.
 8. That it would extend up to the side plot boundary and the back edge of the Nightingale Avenue pavement is, in my judgement, neither critical in the circumstances, nor unusual in the surrounding area. I accept that there is a similar side extension at the property on the opposite corner of the Sheredan Road / Nightingale Avenue junction, albeit that that example is both narrower and set in from Nightingale Avenue. However, the gentle curve of Nightingale Avenue already ensures that No. 19 stands apart from the terraced properties along this street, its rear and gable elevations already prominent features at the southern end of Nightingale Avenue. The additional width of the extended property would not in my judgement alter the nature of this relationship. The proposal would not be an overpowering presence in views along and out of Nightingale Avenue, or harmfully close off or overpower the Nightingale Avenue streetscene from Sheredan Road and there would remain sufficient space at the rear of the dwelling to retain the visual gap between No. 19 and the nearest properties on Nightingale Avenue.

9. Thus, for the reasons I have set out, I consider that the proposal would result in a well-proportioned and well-detailed extension that would respond positively to the character and appearance of the host property and those dwellings around it. It would also do so in a manner that would respect the prevailing character and appearance of the Sheredan Road and Nightingale Avenue streetscene. There would therefore be no conflict with the aims and provisions of CS policies CS2 and CS15, or with DMP policy DM4. In these terms, I am also satisfied that the proposal would secure high quality design of the sort sought by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as a core planning principle.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in light of the Framework and Planning Policy Guidance. I agree that in addition to a time limit condition, it is necessary to impose conditions that set out the approved plans and would ensure the use of matching materials. These, I conclude, are necessary in the interests of certainty and character and appearance, respectively.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons I have set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR