



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/20/3246084

6a Lambourne Gardens, Chingford, London E4 7SG

- 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 Huseyin Misirli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 193120, dated 17 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'demolition of garage and construction of part single, part two storey side and rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For clarity and precision, I have inserted 'London' into the address in the banner heading above as it is listed on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The host dwelling is a semi-detached property on a suburban street and is of brick construction with a tiled roof. The adjoining house¹ is of a similar design but has retained its hipped roof and has had a two-storey side extension with a hipped roof also. The host dwelling has a gable roof and has previously benefitted from the approval of numerous extensions and alterations. The host dwelling is also at a junction where the building line of houses on the road alters, with No 8 Lambourne Gardens also being set back further from the road than the host dwelling.
5. Due to the relationship with No 8, the appeal site has an irregular shape. The proposal would be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling by a notable distance. However, I find that the proposed development would be very close to No 8 and would be read alongside its main elevation. Even with the different building line that No 8 occupies, and the chamfer that has been incorporated in the front section of the footprint of the proposed development, adjacent to No 8, I do not consider that these physical and design features provides sufficient mitigation against the significant visual harm that would

¹ No 6 Lambourne Gardens

occur from the proposed development, especially as the roof would overhang this area of the proposal.

6. Whilst there is no specific policy objection to the principle of a residential extension, I note that the appeal scheme would comprise a strident addition altering the appearance of the building considerably through its overall width. I do not find any harm would arise from the two storey rear projection as this would not extend beyond the existing development to the rear, or the single storey element to the side, even though it would have a flat roof and staggered footprint, as in both instances they would not be clearly visible from the street. Additionally, the proposed hipped roof would represent an awkward design feature, that would relate poorly to the design of the host dwelling, which would be readily visible in the street scene.
7. Whilst the proposed development comprises two storey and single storey elements this still results in a notable, incongruous addition to the host dwelling relative to its existing proportions and design. These factors would diminish and unbalance the character and appearance of the host dwelling to the detriment of the wider street scene. In this instance, I do not consider that a suitably worded condition could be imposed to ensure that otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable.
8. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to the design, character and appearance aims of Policy CS15 of the Council's Core Strategy 2012, Policies DM4, DM29 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and guidance contained within the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2010.

Other Matter

9. Neighbouring occupiers have also expressed concern towards the effect of the proposed development on their living conditions. However, I note that these matters were considered where relevant by the Council at the application stage and did not form part of the reason for refusal, which I have dealt with in the assessment above. Whilst I can understand the concerns raised, there is no compelling evidence before me that would lead me to come to a different conclusion to the Council on these matters. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would not cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

10. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR