



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2023

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/W/21/3266881

117 Blyth Road, Walthamstow, London, E17 8HS

- 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 Mrs Valerie Bell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 201438, dated 20 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'loft conversion'.
-

Preliminary matters

1. The description of development as set out on the Council's decision notice was 'construction of dormer roof extension to main rear roof, together with installation of two rooflights to front roof'. I consider that to be a more accurate description of what is shown on the submitted drawings and so have determined the appeal on that basis.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of dormer roof extension to main rear roof, together with installation of two rooflights to front roof at 117 Blyth Road, Walthamstow, London, E17 8HS in accordance with the terms of the application 201438, dated 20 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The rooflights hereby approved shall not protrude more than 0.15 m from the plane of the original roof slope.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved unnumbered plans: Site plan (1:1250), Loft conversion (1:50 & 1:100), Elevations and section (1:50 & 1:100).

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area.
4. The appeal property lies in a terrace of similar buildings and contains a flat at first floor and a flat at ground floor, with both dwellings accessing the rear garden area. There is a large rear projection to the building, which is seen at the other properties in the terrace and, together with the close spacing of properties, this gives a tightly built-up feel to the area, with restricted views across the terraces when seen from the rear gardens and windows. I did see at my site visit, though, that rear dormers exist at a number of properties, and the Council's delegated report refers to a number in the area.
5. The proposals would see a rear dormer set down from the ridgeline and back from the rear elevation. It would be set in from the party wall to the north, but positioned on the party wall to the south; the floorplans show this being necessary in order to obtain access to the extension.
6. The Council have referred me to their Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions and Alterations 2010 (SPD). This recognises that loft conversions and roof extensions are a common form of extension in the Borough, and a useful way of extending a property. The guidance says that dormer windows should normally be to the rear as they are less likely to have a detrimental impact on the character of the street scene. Guidance in the SPD relating to the design of dormers refers to an objective of ensuring regard is paid to proportions, and the size and location of windows. Specific advice is given in relation to front, side and L-shaped dormers.
7. Thus, the SPD points to rear dormers being the preferred way to provide loft and roof extensions, and that what should be considered in any such proposals is the effect on the character of the street scene. The proposals in this instance would not conflict with this guidance, since there would be no change to the street scene due to the location of the dormer and the proportions of the dormer keeping within the existing roof slope.
8. In views from the rear the scale, siting and proportions of the dormer would not be imposing to the area, due to the limited visibility of the addition and there being other rear dormers in the area. The proportions and design of the dormer would also be appropriate to the scale, design and proportions of the host property. The position of the dormer on the party wall is in this instance not imposing to the property due to the character of the area, and it clearly necessary to ensure internal access is possible.
9. On the main issue it is therefore concluded that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and so would comply with Policies CS2 and CS15 of the Waltham Forest Core Strategy 2012, and Policies DM4 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013, and the SPD. These policies seek to ensure that all new development, including extensions, are of a high quality design that relates to the host building and respects the character of the surrounding area.
10. The appeal is therefore allowed. The Council have suggested a number of conditions and I have attached those requiring matching materials and

specifying the protrusion of the rooflights, to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, and a specifying the approved plans in the interest of precision.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR