
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/20/3256847

52 Withy Mead, Chingford, London, E4 6JZ

- 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 Nikhil Salaria against the decision of London Borough of Waltham Forest Council.
 - The application Ref 201255, dated 16 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor extensions and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The area comprises a mixture of brick built, two-storey, semi-detached and terraced houses with hipped, pantile roofs. The houses and streets are laid out in rectangular blocks with grassed open corners.
4. I observed during my site visit that many properties in this area have two-storey side extensions. These extensions are not immediately obvious as they have been designed to match the original houses. Accordingly most are not set back from the original front wall or set down from the original ridgeline. In addition to the examples referred to in the appellant's Design and Access Statement, I noted further two-storey side extensions at Nos. 12, 57 and 63 Longshaw Road.
5. A wide variety of front porches also exist in the area. These are small and add subtle differences to the properties without resulting in any significant harm to the otherwise generally uniform character and appearance of the area. Although the addition of an enclosed porch on this particular site may result in the loss of off road parking, due to the frontage of the property being reduced in width to the extent that parked vehicles would unacceptably overhang the footpath, I note that there is unrestricted on street parking available.
6. The appeal property is an end of terrace house in a block of four. It has a single flat roof garage to the side, which unlike the proposed single storey extension, is only very marginally higher than the boundary fence. The

brickwork of the houses in this terraced block has been painted different colours. No.46 Withy Mead, at the opposite end of the block, has been significantly altered by the addition of a hip to gable roof extension and a large flat roof dormer, which is more or less level with the rear elevation, the ridgeline and extends the full width of the house with 3 roof lights to the front. The uniformity of this block of houses has therefore already been somewhat reduced.

7. I do not agree that the proposed extension would be unacceptable due to being insufficiently set back or set down. Other two-storey extensions in the area, which mostly blend in very successfully, are not set back or set down and retain uniformity. Nor do I agree that a front porch or single storey flat roof extension would be harmful to the area subject to suitable height, scale, design and materials.
8. However, the overall scale and layout of the extensions, which would extend beyond the rear building line of the dwellings on Longshaw Road, would in my view harmfully detract from the strong pattern and layout of development in the wider area. The open street corners and spaces between the dwellings on corner plots are a very distinctive and positive characteristic of the area. The rows of houses at right angles to one another do not generally overlap and the example on the corner of Withy Mead (No.16) and Otterbourne Road (No.2) is not one which should be repeated. The two-storey side extension to adjacent No.79 Longshaw Road has already reduced the gap between the rear corners of the houses. An extension to the appeal site, of the scale proposed, would further reduce the sense of openness on this prominent street corner.
9. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Core Strategy (2012), policies DM4 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest Development Management Policies (2013) and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2010), which require new development to respond positively to local context and character and to promote local distinctiveness taking account of the spatial context and patterns of development in the local area. I find no conflict with policy CS13 of the Core Strategy and I have not been provided with a copy of policy DM23.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR