



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2019

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/19/3226693

107 Manor Road, Leyton E10 7HN

- 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 Samad Altaf against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 180194, dated 17 January 2018, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for a rear conservatory at 107 Manor Road, Leyton E10 7HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 180194, dated 17 January 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: ZAAVIA/107/MR/101 Issue B, ZAAVIA/107/MR/102 Issue B, ZAAVIA/107/MR/103 Issue B, ZAAVIA/107/MR/104 Issue B and ZAAVIA/107/MR/105 Issue B.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development has been altered slightly on the decision notice. For clarity, the original description accurately describes the development and it is on that basis that the appeal has been determined.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the conservatory on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area with particular regard to its scale and design.

Reasons

4. Manor Road is a predominantly residential street comprised in the main of terraced properties. Within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, a range of alterations and additions have been made to the rear elevations.
5. The appeal property has been previously extended, and the conservatory would represent a further addition across its full width. However, it would be of a

modest projection, with a largely glazed construction which incorporates a step down from the parapet of the existing ground floor extension.

6. Consequently, it would be a subordinate feature of appropriate scale that would not dominate the existing dwelling even when considering the previous additions.
7. The conservatory would be constructed of upvc framed glazing set above rendered blockwork. The upvc frame would match the window materials on the rear of the property and the blockwork on which the framing would sit would be rendered to match the finish on the dwelling.
8. Consequently, as the conservatory would incorporate matching materials it would be appropriate in design to the host dwelling and would cause no harm to its character and appearance.
9. Due to the tall boundary walls which line both sides of the garden, the conservatory would have only very limited visibility from outside of the application site. Consequently, there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area.
10. The development would therefore comply with the aims of Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (2012), Policies DM4 and DM29 of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2010) which seek to ensure that development is appropriate to local character and of good architectural and design quality.

Other Matters

11. The Council have raised some concerns regarding the reduction in size of the rear garden as a result of the proposals. However, I am satisfied that an appropriate level of outdoor space would remain, even after the construction of the conservatory.

Conditions

12. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit. It is also necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR