
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2020

by Rory MacLeod BA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/20/3247488
23 Grosvenor Park Road, London E17 9PD

- 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 and Mrs Duebbert against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 192027, dated 17 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is partial ground floor side infill with second floor extension and rear facing rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for partial ground floor side infill with second floor extension and rear facing rooflights at 23 Grosvenor Park Road, London E17 9PD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 192027, dated 17 June 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 073-P01 Rev(A), 073-P02 Rev(A), 073-P02 Rev(B), 073-P04 Rev(C) and 073P05 Rev(B).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on (a) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding location and (b) the living conditions of occupiers of 25 Grosvenor Park Road in relation to outlook, light and sense of enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal relates to a mid-terrace house on the southern side of the road, similarly designed to 25 Grosvenor Park Road to the west. There are adjacent recessed areas on the shared boundary between each dwelling's two storey outrigger. There are more modern terraced houses to the west of no.25. To the

east is 21 Grosvenor Park Road, a substantial three storey building of recent construction that projects to the rear of the outrigger at no.23 at both first and second floor levels. The terrace nos.17-25 Grosvenor Park Road, the dwellings on the opposite side of the road and dwellings to the rear fronting Pembroke Road are all within the Orford Road Conservation Area.

4. The ground floor extension would infill the recess alongside the outrigger to the same depth as a ground floor extension at no.25. It would resemble its design and massing and would not be readily visible from surrounding properties due to the deeper outriggers. It would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the house or its surroundings.
5. The second floor extension would be limited to the outrigger side of the house and would extend about 3.3m beyond the main rear wall to roughly half the outrigger's depth. It would have a flat roof some 6.7m in length from a position just below the ridge to the house and would be punctuated by two rooflights. The extension would be a bulky addition in relation to the original design of the house, extending well beyond the rear roof slope.
6. But the house, whilst terraced, and built as a mirror image to no.25 does not form part of a homogenous row. Nos.17 and 19 are similar in form but separated by the substantial new building at no.21. The proposed second floor extension would be largely screened from views from the west by the outrigger to no.25. From the gardens to the south, the extension would be seen against the much deeper and higher building at no.21. The mass of the building at no.21 would also screen the second floor extension in views from dwellings to the east and from Pembroke Road. There have been ground and first floor additions to 25 and 27 Grosvenor Park Road that also form part of the present character of the area. The proposed second floor extension would not be out of keeping with the mix of new and extended buildings in the immediate locality.
7. The Orford Road Conservation Area extends over several streets and includes a range of buildings and spaces. Its significance lies in the eclectic mix of Victorian villas, cottages, semi-detached and terraced houses which are best appreciated individually and collectively in street views. The proposal would not change the appearance of the building when viewed from Grosvenor Park Road and would not be readily visible from elsewhere in the public realm. I concur with the opinion of the Council's Conservation Officer that the proposal would have a neutral impact; it would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. The requirements of the special duty set by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to preserve the character or appearance of a conservation area would be satisfied.
8. The second floor extension would be an unusual addition for a dwelling of this type but given the unusual context in which it would be set, and in particular the massing of the development at no.21, the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area or to the conservation area. It would accord with Policies CS13 and CS15 of the Waltham Forest Core Strategy (2012) and Policies DM4 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest Development Management Policies (2013) (DMP) which promote well designed buildings that respond to the local context and character. The proposal would also be compatible with guidance in the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (2010) to respect the street scene, local character and for roof extensions to be kept below the ridge line of the house.

Living conditions

9. As the ground floor infill extension would be to the same depth as the side infill extension at No.25 it would not create any adverse impact in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy. The second floor extension would align approximately with the rear wall and rear window to the infill extension at no.25. It would not affect light to or outlook from this window. The second floor extension would marginally breach a 45 degree line, set as a guide in the SPD, when drawn from the first floor rear window at no.25. There would be some impact on outlook but as the window is south facing there should not be undue loss of light. From certain positions within the back garden at no.25 the second floor extension would be clearly visible but it would be viewed against the greater height and mass of the roof form to no.21 and so would not result in a material overbearing effect or sense of enclosure.
10. The proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of occupiers of 25 Grosvenor Park Road. It would thereby accord with Core Strategy Policy CS15 and Policies DM4, DM29 and DM32 of the DMP which require extensions to be designed to ensure that daylight/sunlight, outlook and privacy are maintained for existing occupants and their neighbours in their homes and gardens. The proposal would also be compatible with the neighbourliness objectives set by the SPD.

Conclusion

11. The proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding location and on the living conditions of occupiers of 25 Grosvenor Park Road in relation to outlook, light and sense of enclosure would be satisfactory having regard to the site's context, and particularly the massing of the adjacent building at 21 Grosvenor Park Road. For the reasons outlined the appeal is allowed subject to conditions limiting the lifespan of the permission, listing the plan numbers for certainty and requiring the use of matching materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Rory MacLeod

INSPECTOR