



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2023 by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/23/3321385

76 Mount Pleasant Road, Waltham Forest, Walthamstow, E17 5RU

- 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. Madiha Qaiser against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 222194, dated 28 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on a prominent corner plot between Mount Pleasant Road and Warwick Road. The surrounding area is residential and comprises of predominantly terraced properties similar in size and scale, with several semi-detached dwellings in prominent corner plots. A number of these have modest single-storey side extensions.
5. The appeal property currently has a two-storey side extension that is set back approximately 1m from the front elevation of the host property. Given the angled position of the property within the plot, the side gable wall of the extension faces Warwick Road, albeit at an offset angle. This also results in part of the existing extension being sited in close proximity to the boundary running adjacent to Warwick Road.
6. The first floor of the existing extension is set back over 1m from the ground floor at both the front and side. This setback assists in reducing the prominence of the side extension, particularly as the adjacent property has no extension. It also provides visual relief in the overall built form, minimising its impact in the wider street scene.

7. The proposal would increase the width and depth of the first-floor extension resulting in the complete loss of the existing setback feature. This would detrimentally increase the scale and mass of the already large two-storey side extension, resulting in an overly bulky and unduly dominant addition that would be harmful to the host property and surrounding street scene.
8. The proposal would also further unbalance the paired property, exacerbating the lack of symmetry with the adjoining dwelling and being markedly at odds with other corner plot properties in the vicinity, which either have no extensions or predominantly modest single-storey extensions. Moreover, without the 1m set back, the proximity of the built form to the boundary along Warwick Road would become even more pronounced when viewed from the street, creating a visually imposing and dominant presence at this prominent corner location.
9. I acknowledge that the side extension would maintain a lower roof ridge compared to the host property and there would be an overall 1m setback from the front elevation. However, these factors due to the corner position of the plot and increased mass resulting from the extension do not overcome the harm identified.
10. For the reasons above, I consider that the proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and street scene. The development, in this regard would conflict with the requirements of Policy CS15 of the Core Strategy (2012), Policies DM4 and DM29 of the Local Plan (2013) and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2010). Amongst other matters, these seek to ensure that new development is of a high-quality design and responds appropriately to the host building and character and appearance of the area.
11. The Council suggested that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy DM23 of the Local Plan (2013) and Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy (2012). However, as these policies relate to health and wellbeing, they are not considered pertinent to the main issue addressed within this decision and consequently have not been determinative in this appeal.

Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Bennett

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR