



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2022

by S Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/22/3296563

56 Endlebury Road, Chingford E4 6QG

- 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 Lyndon Clegg against the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 213778, dated 29 November 2021 was refused by notice dated 27 January, 2022
 - The development proposed is a first-floor extension to existing brick garages to form a home office and games room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

Relationship to the host dwelling

3. The appeal property is in a residential area and forms part of a terrace facing Endlebury Road and which, like its neighbouring residences, has a long rear amenity space which extends to Elmfield Road, the latter which runs roughly parallel to Endlebury Road.
4. At the end of the rear amenity space and abutting Elmfield Road, the host property, along with its adjoining neighbouring properties, has single storey garages which are interlinked with the single storey garages/outbuildings of neighbouring structures.
5. The proposed development is to add a second storey to the existing garage/outbuilding (where the current ground floor uses would remain) to provide a domestic office, w/c and a play area.
6. While the local planning authority (LPA) considers that it has insufficient information in terms of floor plans and elevations of the host property to enable it to fully assess the impact of the proposed development upon it, I was able to see on my site visit that the garages, as extended, by their height and scale would remain subordinate to the host property.
7. Furthermore, while the LPA considers that the extended garages would be of a size to become a dwelling, this would require a separate planning approval and

is not the proposal before me. I have, therefore, considered the appeal proposal upon its merits for the proposed use. The proposal is a householder application, and its use and siting would be compatible with the residential use of the host property.

8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would not conflict with the design requirements of paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) in this regard.

Character and appearance

9. The existing garages form part of an interlinked, single storey collection of such garages and outbuildings facing Elmfield Road and with residential development on the opposite side of it. While there are some differences to the elevations facing Elmfield Road in terms of materials and colours, the garages /outbuildings have roofs of a similar height and are of a comparable scale. These elements create an overall unity to their general appearance.
10. The proposed development would add a second floor in the middle of such garaging/outbuildings and would include a pitched roof to replace the existing flat roof, and dormers facing the road and the properties opposite. By its extra height, its pitched roof and the inclusion of dormers, all elements which are absent amongst the adjoining structures, the proposed development would introduce an uncharacteristic and incongruous appearance in the middle of the row of garages/outbuildings which would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area.
11. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the overall design requirement of policies CS2 and CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan-Core Strategy 2012 which require high quality design which contributes to local distinctiveness, and which makes a positive contribution to improving the urban environment. It would be contrary to policies DM4 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest-Development Management Policies 2013 which also require a high standard of design which relates well to the character and appearance of the area. Neither would it accord with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions and Alterations 2010 which requires development to integrate with its surrounding context.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Hartley

INSPECTOR