



Appeal Decision

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

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/23/3323567

76 Mount Pleasant Road, Waltham Forest, 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 Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 230930, dated 7 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the construction of first floor extension to side elevation.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. This appeal decision follows a recently dismissed appeal decision¹. Both parties were invited to make comment in light of the previous decision. No comments were received.

Main Issue

4. 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

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on a prominent corner plot at the junction of 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.
6. The appeal property currently has a two-storey side extension that is set back approximately 1 metre 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

¹ APP/U5930/D/23/3321385

part of the existing extension being sited in close proximity to the boundary running adjacent to Warwick Road.

7. The first floor of the existing extension is set back over 1m from the ground floor at both the front and side. This joint setback assists in reducing the overall scale and mass of the already large side extension. It provides visual relief in the overall built form, particularly as the adjacent property has no side extension.
8. The proposal would increase the width of the current first floor extension by removing the setback that currently exists on the side elevation. In this regard, it differs from the previous appeal which proposed to remove both the front and side setback at first floor. It therefore would not increase the bulk of the appeal property to the same degree as the previously dismissed appeal.
9. However, the existing large two-storey side extension is already dominant in the street scene. Consequently, the proposed increase in width of the extension, resulting in the loss of the side setback, would still result in a large and bulky extension. It would not appear subordinate and would still further unbalance the paired property, exacerbating the lack of symmetry with the adjoining dwelling. This would be markedly at odds with other corner plot properties in the vicinity, which either have no extensions or have predominantly modest single-storey extensions. Given these considerations, the proposal would be harmful to the host property and surrounding street scene.
10. I acknowledge that the side extension uses matching materials, would maintain a lower roof ridge compared to the host property and that there would be an overall 2 metre setback from the front elevation at the first floor. However, these factors do not mitigate the harm identified.
11. 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.
12. 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

13. 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

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

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR