



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2020

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/20/3256362

8 Fyfield Road, Walthamstow, London, E17 3RG

- 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 Lyn Harris and Giles Clark against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 201457, dated 15 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing loft space by addition of a rear dormer roof extension with partial roof extension over the rear addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellants state that the proposed development "is permitted development...apart from the fact that the dormers are to be clad in zinc." In this regard, there is no evidence before me to demonstrate that the Council has provided a certificate of permitted development, or that a certificate of permitted development has been applied for, for a development the same as that the subject of this appeal, other than cladding.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, brick-built, semi-detached dwelling. It has attractive period features, including two storey bays to the front and a deep, two storey outrigger to the rear.
 5. The appeal property is located within a residential area characterised by the presence of a range of dwellings, including two storey semi-detached and terraced properties and three storey blocks of flats. Houses tend to be set back from the road behind gardens and/or parking areas, with longer gardens to the rear. This and the presence of street trees provides for a pleasant, spacious character.
-

6. During my site visit I observed that, whilst many dwellings have been altered and extended, the majority of changes appear in keeping with host properties and surroundings and as such, tend to enhance the appearance of the area.
7. The proposed development would comprise a large rear dormer roof extension, which would extend towards the party wall with the adjoining property and would project over part of the rear outrigger.
8. As such, the proposal would comprise a large L-shaped addition in a prominent, roof-level position. I find that together, the height, width, projection and materials proposed would, when combined with the location of the development, result in a dominant feature, the size and overall appearance of which would appear out of scale and proportion with the appeal property's rear elevation, leading it to appear top-heavy.
9. In addition, the harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the development appearing as an incongruous feature, out of character with the appeal property's attractively designed brick and tile rear elevation.
10. Taking this into account, I find that the proposed development would fail to appear in keeping with the host property. Consequently, it would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Local Plan¹ policies DM4, DM29 and DM32; to Core Strategy² policies CS2, CS13 and CS15; and to Waltham Forest Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions and Alterations (2010), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

11. In support of the proposal, the appellants refer to an appeal³ relating to another development, elsewhere. However, this relates to a form of development which was different to that the subject of this appeal and which was located in a different place to this appeal. Also, in that other case the Inspector noted that the appellant had secured a lawful development certificate from the Council for a very similar development to that proposed.
12. The appellants also refer to other rear dormers close to the appeal property. However, there is nothing to demonstrate that all of the circumstances relating to these rear dormers are so similar to the proposed development as to provide for direct comparison. Notwithstanding this, the proposal would result in harm to character and appearance, leading to the conclusion below.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Waltham Forest Local Plan – Development Management Policies (2013).

² Waltham Forest Local Plan – Core Strategy (2012).

³ Reference: APP/U5930/D/17/3181427.