



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2020

by Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14/01/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/20/3251594

4 St Peters Avenue, Walthamstow, London E17 3PU

- 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 Richard Keating of RKA against the decision of London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 200356 dated 3 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is rear dormer extension including hip to gable extension, two roof lights in front roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear dormer extension including hip to gable extension, two roof lights in front roof at 4 St Peters Avenue, Walthamstow, London E17 3PU, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 200356, dated 3 February 2020 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. BP.01 Rev P2, GS.01 Rev P2, GA.EX.01 Rev P2, GA.EX.02 Rev P2, RF.EX.01 Rev P2, GE.01 Rev P2, GE.02 Rev P2, GE.03 Rev P2, GE.04 Rev P2, GA.01 Rev P2, GA.02 Rev P2, RF.01 Rev P2, GE.EX.01 Rev P1 and SP.01 Rev P2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. I note that there is a difference between the planning application and the appeal form regarding the name of the applicant/appellant. The original application was made in the name of Mr Richard Keating as applicant and agent. Mr Keating is the agent on the appeal form and completed the declaration. Therefore, I am satisfied that this is simply an administrative error.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling, at the southern end of a terrace of four properties (Nos. 1 to 4) on St Peters Avenue. The dwelling at the other end of the terrace (No. 1) has been extended to the side without emulating the roof arrangement of neighbouring properties. Therefore, there is no longer a uniformity and a change in the balance.
5. St Peters Avenue is L-shaped with terraced and semi-detached properties that overlook an area of open space. The dominant features of the street include: gables above porches/bay windows; front-to-back pitched roofs with pronounced chimney stacks; and limited spacing between buildings.
6. It is proposed to alter/enlarge the roof of the appeal property through a hip to gable extension, adding a rear dormer, and introducing two windows to the front roof slope, so as to accommodate an upper floor. The Council considers the proposed dormer and roof windows acceptable and from the information before me, I see no reason to disagree.
7. Although the roof would be altered resulting in the loss of the gable hip, the proposal would maintain the existing front-to-back pitch, at the same height, using matching materials, thus complementing Nos 2 and 3. The chimneys would be unaffected. Taken together, there would be no further unbalancing of the terrace's roof.
8. The proposed roof would not extend into the gap between the terrace and that of neighbouring properties (Nos. 7 to 10) thus maintaining building spacing. The appeal property is not on a prominent corner location like No. 1, where the roof re-arrangement is disruptive to the terrace and is clearly visible. The existing openings below eaves height, on the front elevation would remain intact. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the appeal property or the surrounding area.
9. Therefore, the proposal complies with policies CS13 and CS15 of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Local Plan, Core Strategy 2012; policies DM4 and DM29 of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013. In reaching this decision, I have also had regard to the Residential Extensions and Alterations, Supplementary Planning Document 2010. Among other things, these require residential extensions to relate to the existing building, the street scene, and character of the area.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time condition, the approved plans should be specified in order to provide certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing dwelling, to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Euan FS Pearson

INSPECTOR