



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2022

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/22/3300499
28 Windsor Avenue, Walthamstow, E17 5NL

- 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 Tracy Marks against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 220786, dated 14 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling. It is situated in a prominent corner location at the junction of Windsor Avenue with Mount Pleasant Road.
 4. It is located in a high density residential area characterised by the presence of a range of house types, including terraced and semi-detached two storey dwellings and three storey blocks of flats.
 5. During my site visit, I observed there to be very small garden areas immediately to the front of dwellings along Windsor Avenue and that cars park on and immediately adjacent to the pavement, leaving only a narrow pedestrian area. This adds to the high density appearance of Windsor Avenue.
 6. Mount Pleasant Road appears as a similarly high density, built-up area, albeit cars tend to park along the road, or within dedicated parking areas immediately in front of dwellings. This and occasional street trees, grass verges and gardens to the rear of Windsor Avenue appear to provide for a greener environment than along Windsor Avenue itself.
 7. The appeal property and its adjoining neighbour mirror a pair of semi-detached dwellings across Windsor Avenue. Together, these four dwellings are sited at an angle to the entrance to Windsor Avenue from Mount Pleasant Road. Garden
-

and/or parking areas in front of the dwellings combine with this angle to create a set back from the road and present a distinct sense of spaciousness within an otherwise densely developed area.

8. The positive impact of this is enhanced as a result of the notable gaps to each side of the two pairs of detached dwellings, resulting in a sense of openness as one passes or enters Windsor Avenue from Mount Pleasant. Further, other than modernisation and a small single storey extension to one of the four dwellings – which itself is set well back within a large garden, these dwellings at the entrance to Windsor Avenue have retained much of their original form and appearance, affording this prominent location an attractive sense of symmetry and uniformity.
9. The proposal would comprise a large side extension. This would extend to two storeys in height and would largely fill the gap between the side of the original dwelling and Windsor Avenue. In so doing, I find that it would severely unbalance the symmetry referred to above.
10. In addition, the proposal, due to its height, width and overall bulk, would draw attention to itself as an unduly dominant feature. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposal filling a visual gap and this would result in the significant erosion of the spacious qualities of this prominent location.
11. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy¹; to Policies DM4 and DM29 of the Local Plan DMP²; and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Documents "Residential Extensions. Alterations" (2010) and "Urban Design" (2010), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

12. In support of the proposal, the appellant refers to permission for another development proposal nearby. However, there is nothing to demonstrate that the circumstances relating to this other permission are so similar to those relating to this appeal as to provide for direct comparison.
13. Notwithstanding this, I have found that the proposal would result in harm to local character and this is not something that is outweighed by a permission for another development elsewhere.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Reference: Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (2013).

² Reference: Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies (2013).