
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2017

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/W/17/3179090

27A Salisbury Road, Walthamstow, London E17 9JW

- 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 Alistair Davies and Leila Latchin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 163638, dated 4 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is dormer loft conversion to first floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the host building and, linked to that, on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 27 Salisbury Road is a two-storey mid terraced house, which has been divided into two flats. The building is of a traditional form and appearance with a pitched roof to the main part of the property and a two-storey projecting element at the rear, which is lower in height than the main part of the dwelling.
4. The proposal seeks to add a dormer extension to the rear of the building. The dormer would be constructed in slate to match the existing roof and would provide additional accommodation for the upper floor flat. In addition, two roof lights, to which the Council does not object, are proposed to the front elevation.
5. The proposed extension, which would have a flat roofed form, would extend across the entire width of the roof of the property at the rear and partly across the projecting element. The form of the extension, compounded by its massing, would not reflect the traditional design or appearance of the building. In addition, the extension would not reflect the difference in height between the main part of the building and the rear element. Consequently it would be a bulky, dominant feature that would harm the traditional character of the building.
6. The extension would not be visible from the front and would have no effect on the street scene, but it would be seen from a number of the surrounding properties at the rear as well as from a footpath. Consequently as the

development would harm the host property it would also be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

7. My attention has been drawn to other similar dormers in the area, including at another property nearby owned by the appellant. However, I do not know of the circumstances in which these dormers were permitted particularly given the very clear guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2010) which states that 'L' shaped dormers, such as this, will not normally be granted. On the basis of the evidence before me I cannot be sure that the circumstances in which those dormers were permitted are directly comparable with those of the appeal proposal. Moreover, whilst I acknowledge their presence, dormer windows of the scale and form of extension proposed do not form the predominant character of the area and it seems to me are not necessarily good examples of development to follow.
8. I acknowledge that the extension would enable the upper floor flat to accommodate three bedrooms. However, I am unconvinced on the basis of the evidence before me that the existing two bed roomed flat does not already provide a good standard of accommodation, or that there is a greater need for three than two bed flats in the area. Moreover, any limited social benefit of the proposal in this respect would be outweighed by the harm the development would cause to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
9. For these reasons, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DM29 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies (2013) which amongst other things requires new development to respond to its context in terms of scale, height and massing and to reinforce and enhance local character taking into account building typology and detailing.

Conclusion

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

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR