
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2022

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: 11TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/21/3288646
29 Greenleaf Road, Walthamstow E17 6QQ

- 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 Ms Job and Maiya Reineke Rose against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 212615, dated 10 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension.
-

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 an end of terrace dwelling located at the junction of Greenleaf Road with Boleyn Close (also known as Boleyn Court). The terrace is short but the dwellings possess a broadly consistent design with 2-storey bay windows, architectural detailing on their front elevations and hipped or gabled roofs with parapets. Although there are some modest sized rear additions, including the property's conservatory and a similar depth single storey addition at 23 Greenleaf Road, the terrace's rear elevation retains a generally consistent appearance, including the rhythm of 2-storey outriggers.
4. The proposed development includes the erection of a single storey rear extension which would, in part, replace an existing conservatory. A previous proposal for a larger extension (8.3 metres in depth) was dismissed on appeal¹, including for reasons related to it not appearing entirely subordinate to the host property. The proposed development seeks to address the concerns raised by the previous Inspector by amending the proposed extension's scale, siting and height.
5. The Council's *Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document* (UDSPD) refers to proposals needing to consider a site's context, including scale, height and massing. The Council's *Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary*

¹ Ref APP/U5930/D/21/3270103

Planning Document (RESPD) includes design guidance that domestic extensions should generally appear subordinate to the property and respect the streetscene and local character.

6. This design guidance in the UDSPD and RESPD is reflected in Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (CS) and Policies DM4 and DM29 of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan (DMP). Amongst other matters these policies expect residential extensions to relate to the original host property and to respect the surrounding area's character. All development should be of a high standard of urban and architectural design which reinforces or enhances local character and distinctiveness.
7. At an overall depth of 7 metres, the proposed extension would be longer and, in part, wider than the conservatory which would be replaced. The depth of the appeal scheme would project further into the large garden than the addition to the rear of No. 23. The scale of the appeal scheme would disrupt the visual and physical cohesion of this short terrace of dwellings.
8. By reason of its staggered design, the widest element of the proposed extension would be sited away from the rear of the property and would be wider than the outrigger. The siting and width of this element of the appeal scheme would fail to reflect the form of the property and further erode the rhythm established by the terrace's 2-storey outriggers. Overall, the proposed development would not represent a subordinate addition to the host property but would visually and physically dominate the rear elevation.
9. Although possessing a staggered form and dual pitched roof, the proposed extension's roof would project above the existing fence and its visual impact would be seen from Boleyn Close and also Greenleaf Road adjacent to the junction. The harm to the streetscene along these roads would not alone be a reason for this appeal to fail but does add to the unacceptable harm which has been identified.
10. Reference has been made by the appellants to what could be erected as permitted development to the rear of a dwellinghouse. However, no details of what could be erected to the rear of this property, including any applications for prior approval submitted to the Council, have been provided. For this reason, the appeal scheme has been assessed on its own planning circumstances. The absence of local objections has been noted but this does not alter the duty to assess this appeal scheme against the relevant development plan policies.
11. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed because the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with CS Policy CS15, DMP Policies DM4 and DM29 and the design guidance contained in the UDSPD and RESPD.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR