



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: 3 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/19/3235614

6 Copeland Road, Walthamstow, London E17 9DB

- 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 & Mrs Alex & Marianne Palgrave against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 191828, dated 5 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a small enlargement and amendment to the rear elevation of the lawful, Permitted Development side-dormer roof extension. The existing gable end wall of the main host building is proposed to be raised with the side dormer roof extension being slightly enlarged to meet this rear (West) elevation. This amendment will enlarge the dormer extension by no more than 200mm to the rear elevation and is proposed to remain within the existing building line. This small enlargement will allow the installation of a Juliet balcony and secondary glazing, improving the quality of habitable space. Except for the proposed change to the rear, 2nd storey elevation, the lawful permitted development scheme remains unchanged in this application'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling, which is located in an established residential area. It is designed with gabled front and rear walls and a pitched roof which slopes down to the side. The neighbouring properties at Nos 2, 4 & 8 have had loft conversions involving the installation of side dormers. These dormers are set in from the edges of the roof, which allows the original pitched roof form to be read. The properties in the area are quite varied in design and several have rear dormers.
4. The Council and the appellant have both given details in their evidence of a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) (Reference 190735 – dated 9 May 2019) for construction of a side dormer roof extension. This fallback position is a material consideration, to which I have given considerable weight in my decision.
5. The previous LDC approval would allow the original pitched form of the main roof to be read because the side dormer would be set back from the rear wall and it would be finished in contrasting materials. It would be similar to the design

- approach of the dormer on the adjoining dwelling and would therefore provide a subordinate and reasonably balanced appearance to the rear elevation.
6. In comparison to the LDC approval, the rear elevation of the proposed side dormer would be flush with the original rear wall and it would be finished in brickwork. There would also be a Juliet balcony and a large window. These alterations would create a 3 storey rear elevation, which would completely mask the original pitched roof form of the building. Whilst there would be a slight pitch to the side wall, the proposed development would appear bulky and it would fail to respect the form and scale of the host building. I acknowledge that the rear element of the proposal would not be visible in the street scene. However, it would be seen from the gardens and windows of neighbouring properties, and the lack of visibility from main roads does not obviate the need to achieve good design. The screening provided by the existing 2 storey rear extension would be limited, particularly in longer views.
 7. There are examples of loft conversions in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site and the appellant has drawn my attention to lawful development certificate approvals for proposed dormers in the area. In particular, reference has been made to 'L-shaped' dormers that extend from the main roof and across the 2 storey rear outriggers. Nevertheless, these examples are large dormers that do not contribute positively to the area. Their presence is therefore not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. Furthermore, the appellant has also referred to a planning permission at No 47 Copeland Road (Ref 161821). However, No 47 is not viewed in the same context as the appeal property and I have not been provided with full details of this case. In any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
 8. I have had regard to the appellant's statement that the Juliet balcony and large rear window would increase the light and outlook to the second floor habitable accommodation. However, this would not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
 9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DM4 of the Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and guidance in the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2010, which, amongst other things, state that alterations and extensions should relate to the original 'host' building and respect the character of the area.
 10. The Council has cited Policy DM32 in the reason for refusal, however this policy relates to neighbouring amenity and therefore it is not relevant to the Council's objection in respect of character and appearance.

Conclusion

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

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR