The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2019

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/19/3223893
65 Huddlestone Road, Forest Gate, London E7 0AW

- 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 Miroslaw Soroka against the decision of Waltham Forest London Borough Council.
- The application Ref 183206, dated 5 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2019.
- The development proposed is a rear extension and loft conversion – full width dormer with extension over rear addition and three roof windows facing including raising the ridge of the original roof.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and area, in particular in terms of the scale and position of the proposed dormer extension and the raising of the existing ridge height.

Reasons

3. The proposed 'L' shaped dormer would span the full extent of both the main rear roof plane of the existing dwelling and the two storey rear projection. Whilst the dormer would sit below the existing parapet walls, which divide the roofs of adjacent properties, the increase to the ridge height of the property would make the dormer higher than the ridges of the houses on either side. Consequently the scale and mass of the proposal would create a visually dominant feature which would result in an awkward top-heavy three storey appearance. The proposal would be overly prominent in the context of the host dwelling and adjacent properties and would therefore harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

4. I acknowledge that the proposal would not be visible within the public realm. However, given that the area is characterised by terraced houses with back to back gardens, it would be visible from the rear gardens of a number of nearby residential properties and the visual harm would be evident to the occupiers of those properties.

5. In view of the above, I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area. The

proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies CS13 and CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Adopted Core Strategy (2012), London Borough of Waltham Forest Local Plan Adopted Development Management Policies (2013) Policies DM4 and DM29, the Waltham Forest Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2010) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2014) which seeks to ensure new development is of a high quality and contextually appropriate design and appearance and both contributes and responds positively to local distinctiveness.

Other matters

6. I note that there are other dormer extensions within the vicinity. In particular, I have considered the dormer extension which has been constructed at No.69 Huddlestone Road. That scheme differs from the current proposal as the ridge of properties which run to the east of that dwelling have also been raised. Therefore that development sits more comfortably within its context than the current proposal would. In any event, each development must be considered on its own merits. As such I have found the appeal proposal would result in significant harm, as I have previously set out.

7. The appellant has referred to permitted development rights as a potential fall-back position. I have seen nothing to suggest that such a scheme would be similar to, or materially worse than, what is currently proposed. As such, I offer limited weight to this matter.

Conclusion

8. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would indicate that the appeal should be allowed. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR