
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2019

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/19/3235658

163 Winchester Road, Chingford, London E4 9JN

- 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 Gerard Flynn against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 190816, dated 7 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is dormer roof extension to main rear roof and two roof lights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for dormer roof extension to main rear roof and two roof lights to front roof slope at 163 Winchester Road, Chingford, London E4 9JN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 190816, dated 7 March 2019.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development shown in the planning application form and the Council's decision notice refers to 'retention'. This is not wording that describes development and I have therefore removed it from the banner heading and the decision.
3. At my site visit I observed that a rear dormer and 2no front rooflights have been installed. The development accords with the submitted plans and I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the rear dormer and 2no front rooflights that have been constructed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a 2 storey mid-terrace dwelling, which is located in an established residential area. The properties in the terrace are designed with original 2 storey pitched rear outriggers. The ridgeline of the rear outriggers adjoin the main roof above the eaves. Several nearby properties, including Nos 149, 155 and 171 Winchester Road, have box-type rear dormers.
6. The visual impact of the proposed dormer in the surrounding area is limited by its location to the rear of the property and the screening provided by its siting

between rear outriggers. The officer's report acknowledges that loft conversions are common in the area, however it states that these are all well set in, with a minimum set in of 20cm from the eaves. Whilst the rear dormer is not set in from the eaves, this is not noticeable due to the screening provided by the outriggers. The use of tile hanging on the external walls is in keeping with nearby rear dormers and it contrasts with the brickwork on the original rear wall, which helps to break up the mass of the rear elevation.

7. The size and position of the front rooflights maintains the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development has not caused significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposed development therefore complies with Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy 2012, Policies DM4 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and guidance in the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2010, which set out the design principles for the area and require development to be well designed and appropriate within its context.
9. I have had regard to the representations from local residents, which raise concerns in respect of loss of privacy; loss of light; noise; and parking.
10. The site is located in a high density urban area where there is already mutual overlooking of gardens. In this context, whilst the proposed dormer affords views across neighbouring gardens, it has not caused a significant loss of privacy. Furthermore, the position of the rear dormer in relation to neighbouring windows ensures that it has not caused a significant loss of light to neighbouring habitable rooms.
11. Any residential use has the potential to create noise and disturbance, however, the amount of additional residential floorspace is modest and is therefore acceptable. There is no substantive evidence before me to show that the development has caused parking problems in the area.

Conditions

12. The development has been constructed and there are no conditions that are necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR