



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: 11 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/20/3256078

35 Downsfield Road, Walthamstow, London, E17 8BY

- 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 Myles Green against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 201207, dated 16 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of extension above two storey outrigger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice. The application form describes the development as "This application is to extend the loft dormer over the first floor bedroom to create a double dormer as per the plans attached. I have just finished the work on planning application PP-08227005v1 (to extend the first floor room over the kitchen and create a loft single dormer). It will create a 4th bedroom in the property and be fitted from the loft landing and follow all building regulations."

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 mid-terrace dwelling. It is located within a residential area characterised by the presence of two storey, brick-built terraces of dwellings with bay windows and short frontages separated from the pavement by low walls. Houses have private garden areas to the rear, providing greenery and visual relief from the relatively dense urban character of the street frontage.
 5. During my site visit, I observed that many properties has been altered and or extended to the rear. Whilst many and varied, such changes generally appear to respect the character of the host property.
-

6. The proposed development would comprise a roof extension over an existing first floor rear extension.
7. The proposal would project from a dormer extension at roof level. It would result in the creation of a bulky addition in a prominent, high-level location. As such, it would result in the appeal property's rear elevation appearing top-heavy.
8. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated by the incongruous appearance of the proposal as an awkwardly located L-shaped extension to a dormer in an area where no other such roof form is visible. This would result in the proposal drawing attention to itself as an ungainly feature.
9. 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 and DM29; to Core Strategy² policy CS15; and to Waltham Forest Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions and Alterations (2010), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

10. 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).