



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 July by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/21/3271769

Wayside House, 27 Beresford Road, Chingford London E4 6ED

- 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 & Mrs Ahmet against the decision of Waltham Forest London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 203708, dated 30 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is part single storey, part two storey rear extension with two storey side extension to replace existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing single storey rear projection and two storey side extension. Construction of part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension. Installation of four roof-lights to front roof at Wayside House, 27 Beresford Road, Chingford, London, E4 6ED in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 203708, dated 30 November 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: 001, 100, 101 Revision A, 102 Revision A, 103 Revision A and 104 dated August 2020.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of the development given on the application form is set out in the banner heading above. However, in the formal decision above I have used the description given in the Council's decision notice and which the appellant has used in the appeal form.
4. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration in my decision-making, planning decisions must still be

made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Both parties were given the opportunity to comment on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. No. 27 is located in a suburban road characterised by two storey semi-detached dwellings. The majority of properties in this section of Beresford Road benefit from large bay windows with a gable above and there is a mix of pitched and hipped roofs. No. 27 has an attached garage with a first-floor extension above which extends across part of the flank wall. This extension features a flat roof with tiled ridge at the front which sits slightly above the main eaves of No. 27.
7. There is evidence along Beresford Road of properties having been extended out at the sides. This has resulted in a visual imbalance in some of the pairs of semi-detached properties and even a terracing effect. Nonetheless, the overall character of the area is one of general uniformity which is enhanced by the openness in some parts of the street. The open aspect is a particular feature of No. 27 given that it sits adjacent to a public footpath and beyond that is a compound which provides a prominent visual break in the street.
8. The proposal would extend across the entire flank wall of No. 27 and wrap around the rear elevation at ground floor. It would extend beyond the height of the existing first floor side extension with the proposed roof tying in with the existing ridge and eaves at the front. At the rear the eaves would be set below that of the existing and would incorporate two gable fronted dormers. The Council note they have no issues with the first-floor rear and ground floor extensions, their concern relates to the proposed roof form. I have therefore focused my assessment on this aspect of the proposal.
9. Whilst the proposed roof element would effectively cover an area above the existing first floor extension which is currently void, it would not, given its profile, appear overly dominant or juxtaposed against the original or neighbouring roof profile. Particularly as this section of street benefits from an overtly open character. Nor would it add to or create a further imbalance to the pair of semi-detached properties than the existing situation. Unlike the existing flat roof, which is extremely unsympathetic to the original character of the property, the pitched roof and gable end would appear to complement and respect the existing character of No. 27 and the pattern of development within the streetscape.
10. The proposal therefore as a result of its design, scale and form would respect the original features of No. 27 and reflect the existing pattern of development seen throughout the street scape. It would not appear overly prominent in views from the surrounding area and given its design would appear pleasing to the eye. It would not cause a greater imbalance between the pair of semi-detached properties than already occurs and would represent an improvement, in design terms, over and above the existing flat-roofed side extension. Overall aims which the Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' (2010) and the Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (2010) seek to achieve.

11. On this main issue, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal complies with the requirements of Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) (CS) and Policies DM4 or DM29 of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) which seek to respond positively to the local context and character, and which seeks to promote local distinctiveness and a sense of place. Whilst the Council have assessed the proposal against Policy CS2 of the CS, I do not feel that this Policy directly relates to extensions of existing residential properties.

Conditions

12. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition is necessary for the materials to match those that are used in the existing property to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall allow the appeal subject to the conditions set out.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR