



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2021

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30TH November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/21/3279775

209 The Avenue, Chingford, LONDON, E4 9SD

- 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 and Mrs Cosgrave against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 210548, dated 24 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the construction of a single-storey front extension to garage; the conversion of the garage into an office, and the insertion of a new window into the side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a single-storey front extension to garage; the conversion of the garage into an office, and the insertion of a new window into the side elevation at 209 The Avenue, Chingford, LONDON, E4 9SD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 210548, dated 24 February 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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: A100 Rev B, A102 Rev B, A104 Rev C
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed front extension on the character and appearance of The Avenue.

Reasons

3. No 209 is a semi-detached house situated on the western side of The Avenue. There is a wide public footpath between Nos 209 and 211. The appeal property has a two-storey side extension that is set back a little over 1 metre from the main front elevation of the house and is set down from the main roof ridge. In common with other houses along this side of the road, No 209 has a two-storey front bay with a canopy that extends through the bay and across the frontage of the house, to form an open porch above the front door.

4. The proposed development would involve the construction of a small single-storey front extension, projecting around 1.7 metres forward of the existing side extension, which would continue the building line formed by the bay window and canopy. This front extension would also continue the front canopy across the rest of the front elevation of the house to form a mono-pitch roof extending up to the sill of the existing first-floor front window in the side extension.
5. Policy DM4 of the Council's Development Management Policies Local Plan (LP) indicates that the Council will expect development which involves the extension of a residential building to relate to the original 'host' building and respect the street scene and character of the area.
6. Policy DM29 of the LP indicates that development proposals should reinforce and/or enhance local character and distinctiveness, taking account of patterns of development, detailing and materials, and other features of local significance, and that they should respond to their context in terms of scale, height, and massing. Also, they should be visually attractive, with architecture that respects its context.
7. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) indicates that, as a general rule, a side extension should be subordinate to the main part of the house and set back from the main building line fronting the street by 1 metre, although there are apparently exceptions to this. Other important points to consider in ensuring a side extension does not detrimentally affect the street scene, are to design the roof and windows in keeping with the original house.
8. The SPD goes on to indicate that there may be some limited circumstances where a front extension may be considered appropriate. Where this is the case, a front extension must be sensitively designed to the highest quality and the materials should complement or match those of the original house. The extension would generally need to appear as if it were designed with the original building and not look out of place in the street. It should ensure that the roof of the extension complements the roof of the original building.
9. The Council contends that the proposed front extension, by reason of its overall bulk, scale and size would be considered an insubordinate addition that would be dominant and overbearing in a visible location going against the grain of development in the area, negatively impacting upon the character and architectural integrity of the host dwelling and the wider area, particularly given its prominent location.
10. The appellant contends that the siting and position of the proposed front extension would not physically represent a projection beyond the consistent building line of the area, and that the retention of the first-floor recess, together with the mono pitched roof would ensure visual consistency. Moreover, the design of the proposal, in terms of scale, mass, bulk and proportions, would not be visually disproportionate to the host dwelling, while the materials would match existing.
11. In this case, the appeal property already has a two-storey side extension that appears subordinate to the main house by virtue of its set-back from the front elevation and its set-down from the main roof ridge. In contrast with the main front elevations of the houses along this part of the road, the side extension

has a plain, somewhat unattractive, frontage without the relieving feature provided by the front canopy that characterises the rest of the street frontage. No 211, on the opposite side of the public footpath, has a side garage only and there is, therefore, no existing balance to the appearance of Nos 209 and 211 in the streetscape.

12. In my opinion, the proposed small front extension at the appeal property would add a feature of interest to the front of the house. It would continue and complement the mono-pitch roof formed by the front canopy and would appear as if it were designed with the original building. It would not look out of place in the street scene and it would respect the context of the host property and the row of houses along this part of The Avenue.
13. In conclusion, I find that the limited scale of the proposed extension, coupled with its sympathetic design features and matching materials, would mean that the proposal would not appear as a dominant or overbearing feature in the context of the existing property or the surrounding area. It would not impact negatively on the architectural integrity of the existing house and it would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area along this part of The Avenue. On this basis it would not conflict with Policies DM4 and DM29 of the LP, nor with guidance on extensions in the SPD. Accordingly, I allow this appeal.

Conditions

14. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR