



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2023

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/23/3321380

8 Woodriffe Road, Waltham Forest, Leytonstone, London E11 1AH

- 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 David Charman against the decision of Waltham Forest London Borough Council.
- The application Ref 222608, dated 7 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2023.
- The development proposed is demolition of existing rear extension, rear double storey extension at ground and first floor and a roof extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing rear extension, rear double storey extension at ground and first floor and a roof extension at 8 Woodriffe Road, Waltham Forest, Leytonstone, London E11 1AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 222608, dated 7 September 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - 1000 Rev PL1 – Location Plan (Dated 22/06/2022)
 - 1200 Rev PL2 – Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Dated 09/11/2022)
 - 1201 Rev PL3 – Proposed First Floor Plan (Dated 09/11/2022)
 - 1202 Rev PL1 – Proposed Second Floor Plan (Dated 30/08/2022)
 - 1203 Rev PL2 – Proposed Roof Plan (Dated 09/11/2022)
 - 1212 Rev PL4 – Proposed East Elevation (Dated 09/11/2022)
 - 1213 Rev PL2 – Proposed West Elevation (Dated 21/09/2022)
 - 1214 Rev PL2 – Proposed South Elevation (Dated 09/11/2022)
 - 1220 Rev PL2 – Proposed Section A-A (Dated 09/11/2022)
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a Victorian, two-storey, end terrace property which is constructed of yellow-stock brickwork, with a dual-pitched roof. To its front elevation, the property has a single ground floor bay window with off-street parking provided to the front. To the rear of the property is an existing two storey outrigger, and a large rear garden. Together, Nos. 4, 6 and 8 Woodriffe Road form a short terrace of two storey properties. By contrast, No.10 Woodriffe Road, is a detached dwelling.
4. Woodriffe Road is predominantly residential in character and has a diverse character with a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced houses in a variety of sizes and architectural styles. Many of the houses in the area have extensions of various types, contributing further to a varied streetscene.
5. The proposed development would extend the property to the rear elevation, through a part-three-storey extension, including dormer extension. The single storey extension would extend the property by approximately 7.49 metres, with the first-floor extension matching the depth of the existing first floor outrigger. The dormer extension, although taking up most of the rear roof slope would be of a similar scale, design, and position to the dormer extension on the rear of No.6. The proposed development would also include the insertion of rooflights to the front elevation. The Council does not raise any objections to the proposed rooflights, and I have no reason to disagree.
6. The appeal site is dominated by existing rear extensions to both No.6 and No.10 Woodriffe Road, particularly the presence of a three-storey flank wall extension to No.10, which is built up to the boundary of the appeal site. In refusing the application the Council stated that the scale and design of the extension would result in an accumulation of non-traditional elements. However, the rear elevation of the host property has a more functional appearance and does not retain a high degree uniformity to these adjacent buildings. In design terms the proposed extension would use materials of a similar appearance and be in keeping with extensions to neighbouring properties. Accordingly, I find that the proposed extension would not result in the unacceptable loss of any notable architectural features nor lead to an unacceptable accumulation of non-traditional elements.
7. Whilst I acknowledge that in combination, the proposed extensions would represent a substantial increase to the size of the original dwelling, when viewed in the context of existing extensions to the neighbouring properties, these extensions would not individually nor cumulatively result in an overly dominant and unsympathetic form of development. The proposed extension would also in terms of its depth, height and design be broadly consistent with other extensions within the surrounding area. It would therefore respect the character of the surrounding area.
8. The rear elevation of the property is not highly visible within the wider area, with no properties located directly to the rear. Where views of the rear elevation are possible, the proposed extension would be viewed in the context of existing rear extensions and alterations to the other properties alongside this section of Woodriffe Road, which are varied in terms of scale and design.
9. Consequently, I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the

surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) and Policies DM4 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies (2013). These policies require, amongst other things, high quality design that responds to its context and respects the character of the area.

Conditions

10. The Council have recommended three conditions, relating to time limit, approved plans, and materials. For the avoidance of doubt, development needs to be carried out in accordance with the statutory time limit and approved plans. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance, materials need to match those used in the existing property.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, I have not found conflict with any policies in the development plan. On that basis, I find no conflict with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate that I should conclude other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR