



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 May 2019

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip. Arch. Dip. (Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/W/18/3217154

Ground Floor Flat, 60 Hatherley Road, Walthamstow, E17 0SB

- 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 James Drury against the decision of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 1827737, dated 3 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is a basement and ground floor side extension with room in the roof and rear dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a basement and ground floor side extension with room in the roof and rear dormer window at Ground Floor Flat, 60 Hatherley Road, Walthamstow, E17 0SB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 182737, dated 3 August 2018, 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 plan: Drawing No. 174-10A.
 - 3) The materials used for the external surfaces of the development shall match those of the existing building.
 - 4) Prior to any development above ground level taking place, details of windows and all other exterior architectural features shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site, 60 Hatherley Road (No.60) is the ground floor flat in a house on a corner plot within an area of suburban housing laid out in the decades around the end of the nineteenth century (C19). Use of standard house types has left many corner plots in the area with an unresolved relationship with the secondary frontage resulting in varied treatments of the residual plot space.

4. A mid C20, 4-storey flat development with undercroft parking occupies the opposing corner. This large building is alien to original elements of the street scene in design, appearance and overall bulk. The south-west corner of the junction is occupied by two-storey housing fronting the side street rather than Hatherley Road. My observations indicate that any inference of consistency in the built form of these corner locations with the wider street scene is not borne out in practice. Whilst corner locations are more prominent than other locations in a street, I am not persuaded that the proposed extension would be 'overly prominent' or the location is 'sensitive' as the Council suggest, as this would disregard the cumulative effect of the identified incremental change to original development pattern and form.
5. The host dwelling and its equivalent on the east side of the intersecting Westbury Road, No. 58 Hatherley Road (No.58), are mirrored designs which differ from their respective adjacent dwellings in size and design detail. Potentially first conceived as a pair of detached houses these properties might reasonably be considered as 'framing' the entry to the northern section of Westbury Road rather than as components of a repetitive street scene.
6. Although the proposed extension would partly extend beyond the implied frontage line in Westbury Road, the openness referred to by the Council is not a positive element in the street scene having regard to the position and appearance of the secondary buildings at the rear of No.58 and No.60, now in independent use. To my mind, the dilution of the original development pattern that I have already described invites measures to retain or reinforce the Hatherley Road frontage on the northern side. The proposed extension would form a natural extension of the frontage adding emphasis to the development pattern, whilst stepping down and back in acknowledgement of the junction. In the overall context the extension would not be visually intrusive or harmful.
7. The proposed extension would be subordinate, it is set back and plainly less substantial than the host dwelling. The proposal shows care in attention to detailing and in this instance I attach weight to this approach in terms of achieving visual consistency in the street scene over a formulaic approach.
8. I conclude there would be no conflict with Policies DM4, DM29 and DM32 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies (2013), Policies CS13, CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) nor with the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2010) which, amongst other things, together seek to give strong recognition to local distinctiveness, also to ensure design responds to context and the character of host buildings. The proposal, therefore, accords with the development plan taken as a whole and, in consequence, the appeal succeeds.

Conditions

9. The Council have suggested conditions which I have adjusted to ensure their relevance and reasonableness. Conditions relating to materials and detailing of external features are required to ensure visual consistency. It would not be reasonable to require a planning application for changes to internal layout as these are not constraints on the existing dwelling.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR