



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2023

by J Smith MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/23/3323731

70 Queens Road, Waltham Forest, Leytonstone E11 1BB

- 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 Tom Skinner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 230391, dated 14 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is construction of dormer roof extension to main rear roof, together with raising of the ridge height and installation roof lights to front roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms part of a terrace of similar houses, albeit that there are small variations, including in the roof form and front door porch designs. In the wider street scene, there is greater variety. Terraced rows make up the predominant mix along Queens Road, broken by a unique detached or pair of semi-detached dwellings. The proposal would introduce a dormer to the rear elevation and three rooflights to the front, as well as raise the roof ridge.
4. The proposed dormer would sit across a large proportion of the rear roof space of the dwelling. The dormer would extend out from the top of the roof ridge but set in from the shared boundary with No 72 and set back from the eaves. This would create a large flat roof addition to the rear of the property.
5. However, rear dormers of a similar size are common in the vicinity. These dormers contain window openings which are not a full length of the roof addition, but are smaller complimentary features. The proposal would include two large windows which would be the full height of the proposed dormer. The combination of a lack of a set down from the roof ridge and the large rear openings would create an addition that would not be subservient to the host dwelling.
6. The proposed three rooflights to the front of the dwelling would be organised in a row. This would create a large line of glazing which would dominate the front elevation due to their combined size and adjacent position. Rooflights are a common feature of the Queens Road street scene. However, where rooflights

are present these are generally small additions which do not dominate the roof plane. Although the existing roof bay projection would help screen some views of the proposed rooflights, they would, nonetheless, be visible when viewed from the wider vicinity along Queens Road. For these reasons, therefore, they would fail to respect and cause harm to the existing street scene.

7. The wider terrace, within which the appeal house is located, has a reasonably consistent roof height throughout, with parapet walls between each house. No 76 Queens Road in this row of terraced properties has increased the ridge height of the property. However, I have not been provided with the information behind this development. There is a general variation of small changes in roof heights along in the wider area of Queens Road, such as proposed in this application. There is minimal coherent rhythm to the roofscape along the street scene. The raising of the roof ridge would rise away from the street scene and not appear higher than the existing parapet walls which divide each dwelling. When viewed from Queens Road, this would appear as a respectful variation due to the variety of roof ridge heights found in the street scene. I therefore do not find harm with this aspect of the proposed development.
8. For the foregoing reasons, due to the proposed scale, position and design of the dormer and rooflights the appeal development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. This combination creates an addition which is not subservient to the roofscape and which would appear incongruous to the host dwelling. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DM4 and DM29 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and Policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy 2012. These policies seek for proposals to respect the host building and existing street scene and create a high standard of design, amongst other things. The conflict with the above policies leads me to conclude that there would be conflict with the development plan as a whole.

Other Matters

9. The appellant states that the proposed rooflights and rear dormer could be constructed under Permitted Development. The question of whether it is permitted development is not a matter for me to determine in this appeal, which is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission. In any event, the appellant has not provided such evidence that this would be the case. Accordingly, the claim relating to permitted development does not alter my view that the development is unacceptable.
10. I note that support for the proposed development has been expressed by an interested party. However, this does not alter the harm I have found the proposal would have to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

J Smith

INSPECTOR