
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: 14TH December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/21/3280338
88 The Ridgeway, LONDON, E4 6PU

- 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 R Cox against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 211200, dated 20 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of first-floor side extension and a ground-floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The decision notice and the officer's report on this proposal indicate that the only objections relate to the first-floor side extension element. I concur with this view and I have, therefore, restricted my considerations to the effects of the first-floor side extension.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effect of the first-floor side extension on:
 - The character and appearance of The Ridgeway, and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of No 86 The Ridgeway by way of light and outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal property (No 88) is a semi-detached house situated on the northern side of The Ridgeway, close to its junction with Endlebury Road. It has a gable end to its eastern side elevation with a large dormer extension in the rear roof slope. It has a single-storey side extension containing a garage with living accommodation to the rear. The proposed development would include the construction of a first-floor above the existing side extension. This would have a full-height and full depth gable elevation at the boundary with the neighbouring No 86.
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, respect the

street scene and character of the area, and protect the occupiers of the existing properties nearby from suffering any excessive loss of residential amenity. Policy DM29 indicates that development proposals should reinforce and/or enhance local character and distinctiveness, and respond to their context in terms of scale, height, and massing. Policy DM32 indicates that extensions should ensure that daylight/sunlight, and outlook is maintained for their neighbours in their homes and gardens.

6. The Council contends that the proposed first-floor side extension, by reason of its design, height, position and bulk, results in an unduly dominant and bulky addition which is out of keeping with the character of the original host dwelling, resulting in unbalancing the pair of semi properties with a detrimental impact on the streetscene. Moreover, the proposed first-floor side extension, due to its overall bulk and position would unduly impact on amenities of the occupants of the neighbouring residential property at 86 The Ridgeway, in terms of loss of light, overshadowing and outlook.
7. The appellant contends that the pair of semi-detached houses of which the appeal property forms a part is already unbalanced by virtue of the existing side extension with hipped roof at No 90, and the existing hip-to-gable roof alteration at No 88. He contends that the proposed first-floor side extension would merely continue the appearance of the existing roof line, and that there are other similar examples of such extensions already in existence along the road and on nearby roads. The proposal at No 86 would, therefore, not be out of character in the street scene.

Character and appearance

8. The Ridgeway, in the vicinity of the appeal property is characterised by detached and semi-detached houses of varying design, though most properties in this area have hipped roofs. No 88 has an existing hip-to-gable extension, while the adjoining No 90 has a two-storey side extension with a continuation of the hipped roof. No 92 would appear to have a hip-to-gable roof alteration while No 80, which is a little further to the east has a large side box dormer. I have no detailed information on these two examples, but it would appear that they may have been constructed using permitted development rights. Other than these, most houses in the vicinity retain hipped roofs.
9. No 88 has a roof ridge a little above that of No 86 and the hip-to-gable extension at the appeal property appears as a dominant feature when seen against the lower hipped roof of that adjacent property. The proposed development would involve the continuation of the roof ridge and gable end to the boundary with No 86, and would exacerbate the apparent bulkiness and dominance of the roof in the street scene. Given that the roof at No 88 extends out some distance from the front gable/bay, at full ridge height, it is already a highly prominent feature of the host property, and the proposed side extension would add a further jarring and detrimental visual component to the streetscape. Moreover, by virtue of its design and prominence, it would not appear subservient to the host property.
10. I acknowledge that the pair of houses, of which the appeal property is a part, is already unbalanced in terms of appearance, but the proposed side extension at No 88, with its over-dominant gable-ended roof feature, would add a further discordant element to the street scene, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area along this part of The Ridgeway. I also acknowledge

that there are other examples of hip-to-gable roof alterations in the wider area, but I have no details of the history of these examples and, in any case, I have dealt with this proposal on its own merits and on the basis of its specific location and visibility in the street scene.

Living conditions

11. The proposed first-floor side extension would continue the existing front and rear elevations of the host property. The current rear elevation projects around 1 metre beyond that of the neighbouring No 86, such that the proposed side extension would also project by the same amount, but on the boundary between the two properties.
12. I note that there are first-floor windows in the rear elevation of No 86, though the nearest window is set relatively well away from the boundary. These windows face north, and I do not consider that the proposal would have any significant detrimental impact on light received by the rear windows or rear garden at No 86. Similarly, the limited amount of the projection of the proposed side extension at No 88 would restrict any meaningful overshadowing of the neighbouring property. I do, however, consider that the height, bulk and proximity of the side extension to the boundary with No 86 would have some detrimental impact on the outlook from the neighbouring property, albeit very limited.
13. In this case, I find that the proposed side extension would have some limited harmful impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of No 86. On its own, I do not consider that this impact would be sufficient to dismiss this appeal, but nevertheless there is some harm to add to the more substantial harm caused by the proposal to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. In conclusion, I find that the proposed side extension, by virtue of its bulk, height and position, would not respond positively to the context of the host property or its surroundings, and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area along this part of The Ridgeway. Although I find that the extension would have very limited harmful impact to the residential amenities of occupiers of the neighbouring No 86, nevertheless there would be some harm, and this adds to the detrimental effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
15. In the light of the above, I find that the proposal would conflict with Policies DM4, DM29 and DM32 of the LP, and accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR

