

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/W/19/3237131
73A Forest Road, Walthamstow E17 6HF

- 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 Paramsothy Paramanatham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 190174, dated 17 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2019.
 - The development is a dormer to the main rear roof and second floor extension to rear outrigger and two self contained flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Procedural Matter

3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application, albeit removing the unnecessary reference to the fact that the application related to the retention of works that have already occurred.

Reasons

4. The appeal site sits within a short group of buildings that feature commercial uses at ground floor with flats above. Terraces of residential buildings of consistent scale and similar appearance, many with two storey rear outrigger projections, continue along this side of Forest Road and along part of Clifton Avenue to the rear of the site. As such the appeal site sits within an area of some consistency in terms of built form and pattern of development, albeit the wider locality features a variety of buildings and uses.
5. The appeal site features a shop and an estate agents office at ground floor. Above them are 2 flats which feature bay projections to the front and a pitched roof that rakes away from the street. The submissions indicate that a 2 storey, flat roofed outrigger existed at the rear of the site that featured parapets to the

- side and centre. These parapets were at a height that was below the eaves of the main roof.
6. A dormer extension has occurred to the roof of the main building and the outrigger has been extended upwards to provide an additional storey of accommodation to each of the flats. These works have added significant bulk to the rear of the existing building and its roofscape which has caused the rear elevation to be dominated by the large additions. Only the smallest of insets from the edges of the original roofs have been provided and as such the extensions appear as insubordinate additions to the roof of the building.
 7. The extensions are not visible from Forest Road and as such the effect of the development on the public domain is minimal. However, the extensions would be able to be seen from within neighbouring properties and, from those vantage points, they would appear as incongruous and bulky additions to the building at the appeal site. This causes harm to the character and appearance of the locality.
 8. Other roof extensions exist within the surrounding area, but I have not been provided with sufficient details of the planning history of those extensions to be able to afford their existence any weight. In any event, those that I could see did not appear to be as dominating of the roofscape or the appearance of their host buildings as the extensions that have occurred at the appeal site.
 9. The appellant has identified that the development has some benefits in terms of providing additional space and improved living conditions for the occupiers of the flats. However, as this would primarily be of benefit to the occupants of the flats and would not therefore represent a significant public benefit to the wider community, I find that this benefit does not outweigh the harm that has been identified.
 10. The development therefore has an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area, contrary to policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) and policies DM4 and DM29 of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013). These policies combine to require that, amongst other things, development is of the highest architectural quality, relates to the original host building and responds positively to the local context and character.

Conclusion

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

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR