



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/20/3264004
307 Church Road, Leyton E10 7JG

- 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 Bostan Mohammad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 202926, dated 25 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a dormer roof extension to the main rear roof, together with the installation of three roof lights to the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a dormer roof extension to the main rear roof, together with the installation of three roof lights to the front roof slope at 307 Church Road, Leyton E10 7JG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 202926, dated 25 September 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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 dated 22 September:
LIVARCH/307CR/101A, LIVARCH/307CR/102A, LIVARCH/307CR/103A, LIVARCH/307CR/104A, LIVARCH/307CR/105A, LIVARCH/307CR/106A, LIVARCH/307CR/107A, and LIVARCH/307CR/108A.
 - 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.

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 host property faces Church Road, with its two storey, rear-projecting flank adjacent to Capworth Street. Nearby properties primarily comprise two storey terraces, whose front elevations exhibit a consistent form and appearance typical of their era. However, to the rear, I observed that many of the properties along this stretch of Church Road have been significantly extended or altered. That includes some roof level alterations, including large dormer windows.

4. The proposal would involve the replacement of the host's existing rear dormer extension. The Council has provided a comparison of the existing and proposed structures at part 3 of its delegated report, which show fairly modest differences in their dimensions. Nevertheless, on the basis that the existing dormer is unauthorised, the scheme would significantly add to the bulk of the property at roof level.
5. Paragraph 5.2.4 of the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2010 ('SPD') sets out that, as a general rule, the Council will consider whether the proportions of a proposed roof extension are appropriate, whether the windows are of an appropriate size and relate to the original house, and if the scheme is suitably detailed. It continues that any dormer above a ridgeline will be unacceptable.
6. In this case, the dormer extension would be set slightly down from the host's ridge, and slightly up from the floor below. In those regards, and as it would be set in slightly from one side, the Council states that it accords with its generally accepted approach.
7. Notwithstanding the site's location on a corner plot, there would be limited views of the dormer extension in the streetscene. In nearby views from Capworth Street it would be hidden, or at least partially obscured, by the host property's two storey rear outrigger with a parapet roof.
8. Additionally, given the tightly knit grain of nearby development, and the site's proximity to the tall blank gable wall of 306 Capworth Street, there would be only limited views of the proposal from nearby properties. Whilst it would be set in from just one side of the roof, in the context of this and nearby roof level alterations, it would not appear out of place.
9. Given its siting and context, the scheme's large bedroom window would not appear as prominent in the streetscene as it does on the drawings. Whilst the building's original windows have been replaced, in terms of their broad style, materials and proportions, the two windows in the dormer would relate appropriately to those in the floors below.
10. For those reasons, and as it would be appropriately finished with matching materials, the proposed dormer extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. I have no reason to disagree with the Council that the proposed front facing roof lights would be acceptable.
11. Amongst other things, 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 state that new development shall be of the highest quality architecture, which responds positively to the local context and character, and that extensions shall relate to the original host property.
12. The scheme would comply with the general thrust of those policies, and would not conflict with the guidance at paragraph 5.2.4 of the SPD.

Conditions and Conclusion

13. I have considered the conditions proposed by the Council against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard time limit condition, in the interests of certainty I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

14. Finally, in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the area, a condition is necessary requiring that the development be faced with matching materials.
15. Summing up, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and it would not conflict with the development plan. Having regard to all other matters raised, including the site's planning history, the appeal is therefore allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR