



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2022

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/W/22/3291440

15B Spruce Hills Road, Walthamstow, E17 4LB

- 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 K Fergus against the decision of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 212859, dated 12 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is construction of a hip to gable side roof extension and a dormer roof extension to main rear roof with extension above two storey outrigger, together with installation of 2 rooflights to front roof slope and one rooflight to dormer roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a hip to gable side roof extension and a dormer roof extension to main rear roof with extension above two storey outrigger, together with installation of 2 rooflights to front roof slope and one rooflight to dormer roof at 15B Spruce Hills Road, Walthamstow, E17 4LB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 212859, dated 12 July 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 site plan, N-LD1640, N-LD1640B, N-LD1640/1, N-LD1640/2, N-LD1640/3, N-LD1640/4 and N-LD1640/5
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the appellant's appeal form as it is the clearest description of the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The proposed dormer would occupy almost the full width of the extended rear roof slope, with an element projecting partway along the rear outrigger. It would be contrary to guidance in the Council's Urban Design and Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Documents (the SPDs). Taken together, the SPDs recommend against L-shaped dormers of the type proposed because it will have too great a visual impact on the character of the original building, and more generally seek good quality design in new development.
5. The extension would not be prominent in the street scene other than the hip-to-gable conversion. The Residential Extension and Alterations SPD identifies hip-to-gable extensions as generally acceptable, having regard to the overall character of the street scene. The Council consider this element of the proposal to be acceptable, given that the majority of surrounding properties have been altered in this fashion. I agree with this conclusion, as there would be no material harm to the character of the area from the hip-to-gable extension.
6. Having regard to the character of the street scene, I do not consider that there would be a substantive difference between extensions to a house, or the first floor flat as proposed. My attention has been drawn to existing examples of box dormers both with and without outrigger extensions within Spruce Hills Road. I note the Council's assertion that such developments generally occur through the exercising of Permitted Development rights, which the host flat does not possess. Nevertheless, there are several such instances of large roof extensions within the immediate vicinity of the site and the wider street scene. Taken together these contribute to the overall character of the area.
7. Given this context, the overall effect of a single further roof extension would be limited. I further note that the outrigger extension would be set down from the main dormer and would be no higher than the boundary ridge. It would also be set well back from the end of the outrigger, resulting in a much smaller overall presence than those on nearby properties. The dormer to the rear slope would be set down from the ridge, set back from the eaves and set in on from the detached wall of the house. While the appeal proposal is for an L-shaped dormer, it would be a comparatively modest addition to the property considering the scale of similar additions in the area.
8. Given the scale of the proposed extensions and the number of roof extensions in the street, the proposed development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with the requirements of Policies CS2 and CS15 of the Waltham Forest Core Strategy 2012 and Policies DM4 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest Development Management Policies 2013. Taken together these policies seek to ensure that extensions relate to the original building, respect the street scene and character of the area.

Conditions

9. The Council has not suggested any conditions. I have therefore had regard to national Planning Practice Guidance to identify conditions that are necessary, relevant to planning and the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

10. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and confirming the approved plans for the sake of certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring approval of the external materials of construction to ensure that the finished appearance of the development is acceptable.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal succeeds.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR