



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2019

by Adrian Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/W/19/3230023

First Floor Flat, 113 Belgrave Road, Walthamstow E17 8QF

- 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 Malik Kaci against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 190406, dated 4 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is loft and rear dormer extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a first floor flat on the eastern side of Belgrave Road, which is characterised by two-storey terraced properties of uniform appearance. Each terraced property shares half of a pitched roof two-storey rear outrigger. A number of properties have large flat roof, L-shaped rear dormer extensions, including the neighbour No 115.
4. The proposed loft conversion works would include 2 front roof lights and a flat roof, L-shaped rear dormer with a return over the rear outrigger. Even though the proposed dormer would be set in marginally from the eaves and stepped down over the outrigger, it would still be a combined flat-roofed structure of considerable bulk and projection. It would lack architectural subtlety in its box-like design and by overlapping between the outrigger and main roof. It would also result in the loss of the remaining section of the rear chimney. The unification with the similar dormer on No 115 would exacerbate the harm through the cumulative bulk of both structures. In these respects, the proposed dormer would be a top-heavy and visually dominant addition to the host dwelling and wider terrace. This would not be mitigated by matching materials, or by creating symmetry with No 115.
5. Whilst the effect would be relatively localised in terms of views from the railway line to the rear and from the flats in Ghandi Way, it would nevertheless diminish the character and appearance of the host property in an unacceptable

manner, with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. I do not have any details of how the existing similar structures to the rear of Belgrave Road came to exist. They may have been constructed under Permitted Development (PD), which the appellant acknowledges, is not an option available to the appeal property. Nevertheless, they do not contribute positively to the area, and for the reasons above, the proposed development would exacerbate this. Their presence is therefore not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. In any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and area. This would be contrary to Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM4 of the Waltham Forest Development Management Plan (2013), and the Waltham Forest Supplementary Planning Guidance "Residential Extensions and Alterations" (2010). Together, these seek high standards of design in new development and extensions that respect the host building, street scene and character of the area.

Other Matters

8. As the appellant acknowledges that the proposed dormer cannot be constructed under PD, any compliance with PD criteria is a matter I give very limited weight in my considerations.
9. The improved accommodation that would be created by this proposal, the absence of any neighbour impacts, and the economic feasibility implications of carrying out a different development scheme, do not outweigh the harmful effects of the proposal, and therefore do not alter my decision.
10. The Council did not object to the front rooflights, and from the information before me and my observations on my site visit, I have no reason to disagree. However, this does not alter my decision.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Adrian Caines

INSPECTOR