

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4TH January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/21/3282238

327 Cann Hall Road, London E11 3NL

- 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 Mrs Jennifer Achonu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application, Ref. 211605, dated 22 May 2021 was refused by notice dated 27 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a roof extension at 327 Cann Hall Road, London E11 in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 211605, dated 22 May 2021 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No. 1416/266 – SK02; OS based composite Location and Block Plan;
 - 3) The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider terrace of which it is part.

Reasons

3. The first reason for refusal refers to alleged inconsistencies between the description of the proposal on the application form and the application drawings. However, I see no reason why the term 'roof extension' on the application form necessarily precludes the minor increase in ridge height, especially when this increase is made clear on the application drawing.
 4. As regards the main issue, from my visit to the site and its surroundings I concluded that the primary objective in the appraisal of any development
-

proposal is to maintain the pleasing character and appearance of the terrace comprising Nos. 319 – 341.

5. The appeal proposal would do this because the slightly higher ridge would tie in with the ridge line for No. 329B, approved by the Council along with a rear dormer in 2015. The roofs of the two dwellings would be 'book-ended' by chimneys and would not in any way be noticeably discordant in the street scene, especially as the terrace already appears to have similar small variations in ridge height along its considerable length. Nor do I regard the modestly sized pair of rooflights that would line in with the first floor windows as being harmful.
6. The proposed rear dormer is more finely balanced in terms of its acceptability, as it would not follow the Council's design guidance as regards proportionality to the roof plane, and as such make the rear of the building appear rather 'top heavy'. However, it is difficult to reasonably resist this proposal given that it would adjoin a dormer of the same scale at No. 329B permitted by the Council and to all intents and purposes the additions would be read together as one. The dimensions are also needed to achieve practicable living space at roof level.
7. Furthermore, the dormer would not be seen at all from the public domain and because of the deep two storey outriggers of these houses even the private views of the proposed extensions would be significantly restricted from the rear gardens. Indeed, this is the case at present for the existing dormer next door which can only be glimpsed from that setting.
8. The main viewpoint of the roof alteration would be from the rear windows and gardens of the terraced properties in Ramsay Road to the south east. However, the separation is two lengths of garden in tandem form between the terraces of Cann Hall Road and Ramsay Road. And given this distance and the wide range of extensions and outbuilding that form the character of the area, I am not convinced that the proposal would be perceived as harmful. This would appear to be confirmed by the Council not having received any objections as a result of public consultation on the application from the occupiers of Nos. 256, 258 & 260 Ramsay Road in addition to there being no response from the more immediate neighbours in Cann Hall Road itself.
9. On balance, I conclude that the appeal scheme would not have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider terrace of which it is part, and would not be clearly contrary to the Council's policies. These are Policies CS13 & CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan – Core Strategy 2012, and Policies DM4, DM23 & DM29 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan – Development Management Policies 2013.
10. I shall therefore allow the appeal subject to conditions on the permission. These are firstly to require the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. Secondly, a matching external materials condition will ensure a harmonious form of development and maintain visual amenity.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR