



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23rd December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/21/3285580
10 Selby Road, Leytonstone E11 3LT

- 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 James Kape against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Cross.
 - The application Ref 212159, dated 4 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a loft extension, internal refurbishment and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modest sized 2-storey mid terrace dwelling situated within a primarily residential area. The terrace comprises dwellings of a simple design with 2-storey outriggers possessing gable roofs which is at a lower level than the main roof. The proposed development includes the erection of an 'L shaped' roof extension which would extend above both the main part of the property and the 2-storey outrigger.
4. The Council's *Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) includes guidance that where there is an 'L-shaped' footprint to the building, permission will not normally be granted for dormer extensions that turn the corner of the 'L-shape' to create one large extension. This is stated to be because such extensions would have too great a visual impact on the character of the original buildings.
5. The proposed extension would occupy the full width of the main roof and, as such, it would not be set back from the neighbouring properties. The rear elevation of the appeal scheme would be sited adjacent to the rear wall of the outrigger. By reason of its scale, width and 'L-shaped' form the appeal scheme would visually have the impression of a bulky third storey being added to this modest sized and simply designed property. The simple form, character and appearance of the property at roof level would be significantly harmed.

6. As claimed by the Council, the scale of the proposed development would give the property a top-heavy appearance which would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the terrace's roofscape, notwithstanding the dormer erected within the rear roofslope of 6 Selby Road. The significant harm caused to the character and appearance of the property, and the roofscape of the terrace by the proposed extension, would be visible from Napier Road.
7. Reference has been made by the appellant to other roof extensions which have been undertaken within the surrounding area, including 'L-shaped' dormer extensions, and a number of these were observed during the site visit. However, in the majority of cases, the detailed planning circumstances of these other schemes have not been provided and some of these extensions do not visually make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area because of their design, form, scale and bulk.
8. Where planning details have been provided for the 'L-shaped' dormer extensions at 307 Church Road and 118 Malvern Road¹ these schemes were assessed on their own circumstances and can be distinguished from the proposed development, including by reason of their smaller scale and the siting of the rear elevations being set further back from the rear walls of the outriggers. Accordingly, limited weight is given to these other schemes in the determination of this appeal.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the property and the terrace and, as such, it would conflict with Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy and Policies DM4 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies. Amongst other matters, these policies require the highest quality architecture and urban design which reinforces local character and for alterations to residential buildings to relate to the original host building. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/U5930/D/20/3264004 and APP/U5930/D/20/3274650