

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/21/3283757

67 Poppleton Road, Leytonstone, London E11 1LP

- 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 Noel Charles against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application, Ref. 211575, dated 14 May 2021 was refused by notice dated 9 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a proposed outrigger loft conversion, including a new dormer; hip to gable; raised ridge height, and 5 rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene at the junction of Poppleton Road and Preston Road.

Reasons

3. The Council's concern is that the proposed alterations and additions to the existing two storey outrigger of the host dwelling would compromise the architectural integrity of the original building.
 4. Two storey outriggers are a common feature of house design in the area and indeed in many other parts of London. Normally they are discreetly sited to the rear of the dwelling and hidden from public view by adjoining properties. However, in this case the corner position of the dwelling at the junction with Preston Road means that although to the rear of No. 67, the outrigger has a particular prominence in the street scene.
 5. Because of this, the subordination of the outrigger to the principal part of the building, which is an inherent feature of their design, is of particular importance. However, the appeal scheme would involve a hip to gable alteration, an increase in ridge height and the addition of a dormer on the side facing No. 65.
 6. In combination, these increases in the outrigger's size would be substantial and noticeable in the Preston Road street scene, whilst the addition of roof lights on that right side elevation would draw attention to the presence of the additional
-

accommodation in the roofspace (although these are not objected to by the Council). Furthermore, these alterations and additions would be read with views of the flank and rear of the existing flat-roof bulky dormer, which is already a prominent feature on the dwelling.

7. I acknowledge that the additional dormers would be less obtrusive, but they would still be clearly visible looking north eastwards along Preston Road towards the junction with Poppleton Road. And it is the aggregate effect of the alterations and additions that would decrease the outrigger's subordination. This would cause harm and adversely affect the ability '*to understand the host property's originally intended architectural form*' as cited in the Notice of Refusal.
8. I have noted the matters raised in the grounds of appeal, but for the most part these state the features of the appeal scheme that are in fact acceptable. They are not persuasive in terms of what I consider to be the Council's legitimate objections to the application proposal.
9. Accordingly, on this issue I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. This would be in conflict with Policies DM4A)i) & DM29A)iv) of the Waltham Forest Local Plan – Development Management Policies 2013 and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Other Matter

10. The officer's report contends that the four windows in the proposed left side elevation of the building would unacceptably affect the living conditions for the occupiers of No. 65 Poppleton Road by reason of overlooking. However, the report also explains that if an approval were forthcoming, a condition for the windows to be obscure glazed would be imposed to preclude any loss of privacy for the neighbours. I have assumed that it is for this reason that there is not a second reason for refusal relating to the 'residential amenity' of No. 65.
11. In this regard, whilst I have some reservations in terms of the outlook for a study being restricted to the aspect through a roof light, I note that the study is a 'secondary room' with its only access from a bedroom and that it also serves as the access route to a walk-in wardrobe.
12. In these circumstances I consider the suggested condition would be acceptable for the living conditions for both the occupiers of No. 65 and the occupiers of the accommodation in the host property. However, this does not outweigh the harm that would be caused in respect of the main issue in this appeal.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons explained above, I dismiss the appeal.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR