



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2020

By Julie Dale Clark BA(Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04/11/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/20/3253845

4 Meadow Close, Chingford E4 7LD

- 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 Mrs Nana Raphael against the decision of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Council.
 - The application Ref 200620, dated 18 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is part single part double storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part single part double storey rear extension at 4 Meadow Close, Chingford E4 7LD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 200620, dated 18 February 2020, 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 materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:-
 - *Location Plan; Drawing Nos. RAP. JAN.20C & RAP. JAN.20D.*

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached house located in a corner position at the end of Meadow Close. The arrangement of houses is fairly unusual and No 4 appears tucked behind No 5, adjacent to No 3. The topography of the area means that the rear garden to No 4 rises quite steeply from the house to its rear garden fence. The garden has been terraced and at the time of my site visit work was underway on the house and garden. The overall proposal would extend across the width of the house, part single storey and part two-storey. The reason for refusal refers to the first floor extension and therefore it is the two-storey element of the proposal which is of concern to the Council, in particular, its first floor. The single storey element is not in dispute which I agree with.

4. Amongst other things, Core Strategy Policy¹ CS15 establishes that new development will be expected to ensure the highest quality architecture and urban design that should respond positively to the local context and character. Development Management Policy² DM29 also highlights the expectation for a high standard of urban and architectural design. Development Management Policy DM 4 relates to residential extensions and alterations and indicates that the Council expect extensions to relate to the original 'host' building, respect the street scene and the character of the area, amongst other things.
5. I have paid particular attention to the siting of this house at the end of the cul-de-sac and whilst unusual, an extension to the rear would not have an unacceptable impact on the overall character or appearance of the area. The first floor element would enlarge an existing bedroom and provide it with an en-suite bathroom but the number of bedrooms would not change. The introduction of the gable feature to the design of the house would alter the appearance of the rear elevation but I do not consider that it would be bulky or top heavy. It would not be of a scale that I find unduly dominant and therefore I find no reason to withhold permission.
6. I note the concerns raised by neighbours and I have noted that 4 Meadow Close sits amongst a very closely built development and I acknowledge that parking and vehicular movements can be difficult. I also note the difference in levels and the concerns about drainage. I also note comments about privacy and overdevelopment. Whilst I appreciate these concerns I do not consider that the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties would be unduly harmed.
7. In considering other matters raised I note that Core Strategy Policy CS2 is referred to on the decision notice along with Supplementary Planning Documents, but copies have not been submitted with the appeal documents. However, the policies submitted and referred to above make the Council's position on this proposal clear and so the lack of these documents has not influenced my assessment which I have based on the submitted and adopted Development Plan policies, my site visit and the other appeal documents submitted.
8. I have taken all matters raised into consideration but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the area and it would not conflict with policies CS15, DM 4 or DM29 referred to above. The appeal therefore succeeds.
9. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the Planning Practice Guidance³. I agree that a condition requiring the materials of construction to match those in the existing house is necessary in the interests of a satisfactory appearance. A condition requiring the extension to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

¹ Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy, Adopted March 2012.

² London Borough of Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan. Adopted October 2013.

³ Planning Practice Guidance Published 6 March 2014. Updated 23 July 2019.