
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2019

by Neil Smith BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/W/19/3223401
22A Erskine Road, London E17 6RY

- 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 Nicolas Piován against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 183181, dated 23 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is a loft extension, double dormer, in line with permitted development guidelines to ensure consistent roof shape among adjacent context.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposals on the character and appearance of the appeal site and of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a first floor flat in a row of two-storey terraced properties. The ridge lines of the dwellings in this terrace have slight variations in height and roof lights to the front are a common feature.
4. The appeal proposal has three elements. It seeks to install three roof lights to the front; raise the ridge height of the roof and construct an 'L'-shaped dormer roof extension to main rear roof and above part of the two-storey outrigger. Together these would create additional living accommodation including a bedroom with en-suite bathroom and a study room.
5. The Council did not oppose the proposed rooflights, and on the evidence before me, I have no reason to reach a different conclusion in this respect.
6. The slight increase in height of the main roof would align with the heights of the adjoining dwellings and would create a consistent roof height in this section of the terrace. The rear dormer above the main roof would extend to the full height of the ridge line. The dormer would also extend the full width of the appeal property with a set back from the rear elevation. This would mirror the dormer on the adjacent property, No 20, and this would add some balance to the roof when viewed for the gardens of the adjacent properties. Notably however, the adjoining properties do not have dormers which extend above

part of the two-storey outrigger. When considered together, the overall 'L'-shaped dormer would be unacceptably disproportionate to the scale of the existing dwelling due to its excessive size and bulk.

7. The appellant have drawn my attention to properties within close proximity and to further examples in the wider area of the appeal dwelling that have been extended with roof extensions. I have not been provided with the full planning histories to each of those developments and the particular circumstances which may have applied. Notably, however, the adjoining properties, No 20 and 24, do not have dormers which extend above the two-storey outrigger. In any event, the fact that similar developments have been granted planning permissions is not, on its own, a reason to allow harmful development. I have therefore determined this appeal on its own merits.
8. However, given my findings on the rear dormer, I conclude that the proposal, would, by virtue of its size and overall bulk, be out of keeping with the host property, resulting in an unduly dominant addition to the roof harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal site and of the surrounding area.
9. There would be conflict with Policy CS15 of the adopted Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) Policies DM4 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies (2013) and Waltham Forest Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Extensions and Alterations (2010) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure high quality architecture and urban design.

Other matters

10. The Officer report identifies harm to outlook and that the proposal would have an overbearing impact upon No 24, but it is not cited as a reason for objection and I am mindful of the absence of any concerns raised by residents. I have considered these matters and I do not consider that the appeal proposal would cause any harm to the living conditions to this neighbouring property.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is dismissed.

Neil Smith

INSPECTOR