The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2021

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/20/3262014
74 Vicarage Road, Leyton E10 5EA

- 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 Syed Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
- The application Ref 201742, dated 12 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2020.
- The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The buildings close to the site on this side of Vicarage Road comprise predominantly a mix of semi-detached and terraced properties. Their two storey form, broadly similar style, and many shared design features provide a sense of cohesion to the streetscene.

4. To the rear, the buildings display much greater variety, as many have been extended or altered. However, they typically retain a prominent two storey outrigger, some with a modest single storey projection beyond. Consequently, looking from the properties' rear gardens, they retain a degree of consistency and a rhythm to their rear faces; and their original form is still clearly apparent.

5. The appeal property has a flat-roofed, white rendered, ground floor side projection, and a short, pitched roof rendered extension to the rear. Together these wrap around the original, brick, 'L' shaped two storey dwelling. The proposal includes the provision of a sloping roof above that side projection, and a further single storey 6 metre deep extension beyond the dwelling's rear face.

6. As a result, and as evidenced by Figure 2 of the Appeal Statement, the dwelling would project significantly deeper to the rear than its neighbours, including the two storey rear projection at No 72, and compared to others nearby along this side of Vicarage Road.

7. Cumulatively, with the side projection, its long single storey flank elevation would be significantly out of proportion to the dimensions of the host property. Additionally, its single storey bulk, and its considerable length, would not relate well to the original building's two storey, 'L' shaped form. It would thus dominate the host and, with its very elongated appearance, it would significantly diminish the extent to which the building's original form and proportions could be 'read'.

8. The scheme would have a limited height and, according to the appeal statement, would be faced with 'brick effect render', and a slate roof to match the host. Without further details, I am not persuaded that that render, which differs from what was set out in the drawings and the application form, would improve the building's appearance.

9. Irrespective of that, seen from nearby properties, including from their often long rear gardens, the scheme's bulk and depth would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

10. As a result, it would conflict with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2018, Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy 2012, and Policies DM4 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013. Amongst other things, these require new development to be of the highest quality architecture, which responds positively to local context and character; and require extensions to relate to the original host property.

11. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') requirement for good design.

12. In its favour, the scheme would provide an enlarged kitchen area for the dwelling's occupants. It would thereby improve their living conditions, in accordance with the Framework's objective of creating places with a high standard of amenity.

13. However, that benefit to the occupiers, does not outweigh the significant harm that the scheme would cause. It would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR