



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020

by Rachael Pipkin, BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/W/19/3233582

76 Wood Street, Walthamstow, E17 3HX

- 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 S Kayani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref: 19/1336 dated 29 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a roof top extension to the existing property, creating a new storey with 1 no. 1-bed apartment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. During the appeal, the appellant submitted an amended drawing showing waste management for the proposed single dwelling in order to overcome the Council's second reason for refusal. This drawing does not indicate any additional development but includes additional detail about the proposed waste management. As this is the provision of additional detail, I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by my taking the amended plan into account in my determination of this appeal and I am proceeding on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area;
 - the effect of the proposed development on the setting of the Grade II listed building; and
 - whether the proposed development makes adequate provision for waste and recycling facilities.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Number 76 Wood Street (No. 76) is located within an area characterised by a mix of uses and buildings of varying ages and heights in a range of different

styles and designs. No. 76 is a two-storey terraced property positioned within a shopping frontage but unlike either of the adjoining properties it is entirely residential. It features two two-storey double bay windows either side of a central entrance door with a shallow pitched, hipped roof and smaller but prominent hipped roof features above each of the front bays. The property is enclosed to the front by a fenced front garden area giving it a domestic appearance within this mixed-use area.

5. The adjacent property is a three-storey building with a ground floor shop unit forming part of a uniform terrace of properties within a parade of shops, Golden Parade. On its other side, it adjoins a single-storey grocer's building, which is a Grade II listed building indicated to date from 1750. This building is constructed of timber with weatherboard cladding with a pitched roof.
6. The proposed development would replace the existing low-pitched roof of the property with a mansard roof extension featuring two front and two rear facing dormer windows. Within the front garden, a brick-built bin store and a bicycle store would be positioned along the two side boundaries.
7. The appeal property with its shallow pitched roof and double bay windows is unlike development within the wider area and distinctly different from the two adjacent properties. The limited views of the shallow roof give prominence to the bay windows and the two individual hipped roofs above, giving the building a distinctive appearance with a strong vertical emphasis. The proposed mansard roof extension, with its steep roof pitch and front facing dormers, would be a large, bulky and prominent addition. The front dormers, whilst evenly spaced, would be offset from the central windows of the bay appearing at odds with the vertical alignment of the building. This would detract from the balanced appearance of the building. This, in combination with the height and bulk of the proposed mansard roof, would harm the character and appearance of the host property.
8. The appeal property, in the context of the adjacent properties, provides an evenly stepped transition from the taller three-storey building on Golden Parade to the adjacent single-storey building. The proposed development would create a more significant and stark height difference between No. 76 and this single-storey shop unit, appearing dominant, bulky and discordant in this context. There would be visual harm to the street scene arising from this. It would also impact upon the setting of the listed building which I return to in my reasoning below.
9. Furthermore, the proposed bin and bicycle storage to the front of the building, despite being relatively low in height, would add visual clutter to the open and spacious garden area. Due to the position of the garden, which protrudes into the wide pavement along Wood Street, these storage units which would be visible above the boundary wall and fence, would appear as prominent and incongruous features within the street scene.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies CS2 and CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) and Policy DM29 of the Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 (DMP) which together require new development to be of a high quality design and to respond positively to local character and their context in terms of scale and height. It

would also not accord with the design principles of the Waltham Forest Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2010.

Setting of the Listed Building

11. The adjacent listed building, due to its age, timber construction and single-storey height, is a unique building within the street scene. Although no longer in its original use as a butcher's shop, the building is still in use as a shop and retains much of its original character. The setting of this listed building is largely derived from its position on a commercial street, being set within a mixed-use area and close to other shop units. The appeal site, being an entirely residential property, does not contribute to the setting of this listed building in this context.
12. However, the listed building in combination with the appeal property and the adjacent parade of shops provides a composition of three buildings which together reflect phases of development along Wood Street from the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. The different heights of these buildings create a distinctive pattern of stepping down evenly in height from the three-storey property to the single-storey listed building. This arrangement of buildings is visually prominent and collectively contributes to the setting of the listed building.
13. The additional height that the mansard roof would add to the appeal property would make No. 76 significantly taller than the listed building. This would disrupt the established stepped pattern, harming the relationship between these buildings as set out in my reasoning on character and appearance above. This would be harmful to the setting of the listed building as part of this composition of buildings.
14. I conclude that the proposed development would fail to preserve the setting of the Grade II listed building. It would therefore conflict with Policy DM28 of the DMP. This permits development that would not be harmful to the significance of heritage assets or their settings.

Waste management

15. The proposed development would provide storage for refuse and recycling bins within the front enclosed forecourt area. The appeal property is currently in use as 4 flats, the appeal proposal would increase this to 5 flats.
16. No information has been provided about the existing waste management and storage facilities associated with the existing use and what would be required with the increase in dwellings within the building. In the absence of these details, it is not possible to determine whether the proposed arrangements would be adequate.
17. I therefore cannot conclude that the proposed development would make adequate provision for waste and recycling facilities. I am not therefore satisfied it would comply with Policy DM32 of the DMP and Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy. These policies, together and amongst other things, requires new development to meet appropriate environmental standards to make provision for storage, collection and disposal of waste. The decision notice also refers to Policy DM7 of the DMP. However, this policy relates to external amenity and internal space standards and is not directly relevant to the provision of waste management.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

18. The Government is seeking to significantly boost the supply of housing. The scheme would provide an additional one-bedroom residential unit within an accessible urban location, without the need for a car. These are positive aspects of the scheme that weigh in favour of the development. However, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property, surrounding area and the setting of a listed building.
19. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict. For this reason, the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR