



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/19/3240607

4 College Gardens, Chingford E4 7LG

- 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 Stewart Smith against the decision of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Council.
 - The application Ref 192436, dated 23 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached, dwelling located on the eastern side of College Gardens opposite the junction with Nevin Drive. It lies within an established residential area characterised by pairs of large semi-detached properties. College Gardens itself slopes downwards to the northwest and contains a mix of architectural styles. On my site visit, nonetheless, I noticed that many properties displayed common features such as first floor projecting hipped roofs, two-storey front bays and white render. The street is also characterised by open gaps between each pair of semi-detached dwellings. Furthermore, to the east, lie three pairs of large, recently built, semi-detached dwellings.
 5. The appeal property mirrors the adjacent property at No.6, both featuring a recessed central element, a projecting two-storey pitched gable and a side element with a gambrel-style roof. There is therefore a strong symmetry between the two properties.
 6. The proposal would result in a large side and rear two-storey extension. Whilst the proposed development attempts to replicate the underlying character and
-

appearance of the existing property, by extending the gambrel style roof and by retaining the garage entrance, its resultant width and height would be out-of-scale and obtrusive. It would thus fail to appear as a subordinate extension and would drastically alter the appearance of the appeal property and No.6 that, together, form a cohesive and symmetrical structure. Although the appellant states that the development would not be overly dominant, and that its width increase would be typical of side extensions in the borough, I find it to be excessive and out-of-keeping with the surrounding area. The appellant also contends that the roof of the extension would not be readily visible in the street scene. However, due to its siting, fronting on to College Gardens, it would be entirely visible from the public realm.

7. I note the reference to the extension at 16 College Gardens. I do not find it to be directly comparable to the proposal before me seen as it appears to be an extension above an existing single storey garage and would not appear to extend out as much as the appeal proposal. It also ties in well with its host dwelling due to its recessed front elevation at first floor level. Most significantly, it does not adversely unbalance the symmetry with the adjoining dwelling to an unreasonable degree. Therefore, this other case does not alter my decision which has been reached on the individual merits of this case.
8. I therefore find that the scale, width and height of the proposal would not adequately tie in with the host dwelling and would harm the character and appearance of College Gardens and the surrounding area.
9. Given the above, the proposed development would conflict with Policies CS2 and CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy, and Policies DM4, DM29 and DM32 of the Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan which together seek to ensure proposals are well designed and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area in which they lie. This is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which aims to ensure proposals are sympathetic to local character. I have also had regard to the 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the 'Urban Design' SPD.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the appellant's personal family needs with regards to the provision of additional self-contained space. Although I sympathise with these personal considerations, I consider that the permanent harm to the public realm through the erection of the proposed extension outweighs the private benefits to the appellant.
11. I note the appellant's frustration with regards to the processing of the planning application and the guidance received from officers within the London Borough of Waltham Forest Council, as outlined in the appeal statement and attached email correspondence. I also note the appellant's objections to the similarities between the Officer Report and the 2017 appeal decision (ref APP/U5930/D/17/3178720). However, these concerns are not planning matters to which I can attach any significant weight and they would not outweigh the harm identified in the main issue.

Recommendation

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

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR