
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2019

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/19/3234735

57 Rolls Park Avenue, Chingford, Waltham Forest E4 9DG

- 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 Ben Yong Wang against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 184149, dated 11 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The Appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of the development from the application form as the appellant has confirmed that the description has not changed.
3. I note from the appellant's statement and from my site visit that since the development was refused planning permission for a hip to gable dormer roof extension has been added to the roof of the property. This roof extension is not shown on the drawings. The appellant has suggested that the dormer roof would not prevent the proposed extension from being constructed. Nevertheless, I have taken the siting and design of the roof extension into account in coming to a decision on the appeal scheme.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Number 57 Rolls Park Avenue is an end of terraced property located on a street of similarly designed houses. The properties have comparable building lines to their front elevations. The rear gardens are generally modest and back on to a rear alleyway which separates Rolls Park Avenue from the rear of properties facing on to Royston Avenue. The rear alleyway is narrow and poorly surfaced but appears to be used for access which can be gained from either end of the street and from Royston Avenue. At my site visit I viewed the site from the alleyway, and I noted that the rear elevations of properties to the ground floor

- are mostly obscured from view by existing outbuildings, however, the upper floors and roofs of the buildings are generally visible.
6. The appeal property has a ground floor extension with a flat roof which projects a considerable distance in to the rear area. An outbuilding of similar materials has also been erected in the rear garden. The recently constructed roof extension consists of a hip to gable extension and rear dormer structure.
 7. The proposed first floor extension would, according to the drawings, project out from the rear of the property by 3.125 metres and would be 2.951 metres wide. It would be located away from the joint boundary with the attached property and has been designed with a hipped roof.
 8. Most adjacent properties have been extended at ground floor level and some have roof extensions including dormer windows. That said, the appeal property is already noticeably more developed than its neighbours. The ground floor extension with its flat roofed parapet design is a bulky addition which is more imposing than adjacent ground floor extensions. This, along with the outbuilding and the roof extension results in much of the original form of the building to the rear being obscured. However, in common with its neighbours, the property retains the first-floor rear elevation on its original building line.
 9. To my mind, the proposal would result in a bulky and incongruous extension owing to the extent of its projection from the rear of the original dwelling. This is particularly the case given the absence of such extensions in the vicinity of the site. This harm is further exacerbated by the cumulative amount of extensions at the property, including the dormer window.
 10. In coming to that view, I accept that the extension itself is well designed and it would not be readily visible from public vantage points. Nonetheless, the harmful effects of the structure would be apparent from a significant number of properties that have windows and garden areas adjacent to the site.
 11. The Council has also raised concern over the width of the extension. However, in this case, I consider that this is not a determinative factor.
 12. Finally, the appellant has referred me to other sites nearby. I saw these at my site visit. Although there are some similarities between the design of these first-floor extensions and the appeal site their contexts are somewhat different. Moreover, I have considered the proposed extension on its own merits based on the particular site circumstances.
 13. Taking all matters into account, I conclude that the extension would detract from the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy CS2 and CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (2012), Policies DM4 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies (2013) and Supplementary Planning Documents for Residential extensions and Alterations (2010) and Urban Design (2010). These policies collectively require careful consideration of the scale, height and mass of development in relation to its immediate surroundings and seek to ensure that development relates to the host building and respects the character of the area.

Conclusion

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

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR