



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2024

by B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/23/3330950

3 Goldsborough Crescent, Chingford, Waltham Forest E4 6PY

- 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 Martin Block against the decision of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref 230273, dated 31 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear extensions and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) in December 2023, replacing the previous version dating from September 2023. The amendments made did not have any bearing on the issues in this appeal, and it was therefore not necessary to seek comments from the main parties on the updated Framework.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether sufficient information has been submitted with respect to surface water drainage.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached property with a hipped roof occupying a corner plot. It has a large side garden area bounded by a low wall with hedging above. The property is constructed in brick and has a two storey bay with a gable roof feature and red hanging tiles. Whilst properties within Goldsborough Crescent have been altered and extended over the years, their architectural uniformity is a positive characteristic which contributes to the character of the area.

5. The proposed side extension would be large compared to the original host dwelling, and would add considerable width to the property. It would have a pitched roof which would adjoin the main roof without any set-down in roof level. Whilst the design of the two-storey extension includes a set back from the main front elevation of the dwelling, this would not significantly reduce the overall scale and mass of the proposed extension. As a result of its width and lack of subservience, the proposal would significantly unbalance the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties.
6. The adjoining semi has had a hip to gable conversion and a large rear dormer. However, these additions are neither as wide or as prominent as the appeal proposal. Consequently, their existence would not reduce the unbalancing effect which I have found that the proposal would have on the pair of semis.
7. The Council refer to its Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (SPD). In respect of side extensions the SPD indicates that, as a general rule, these should be subordinate to the main part of the house and set-back from the main building line fronting the street by one metre. Whilst it would be set back by a metre, the side extension would conflict with the SPG guidance in relation to its subordinate appearance.
8. The two storey side extension would also have limited set back from the site's side boundary. This would create a dominant and uncharacteristic feature in the street scene, which would reduce the plot's sense of spaciousness and would be particularly notable due to the appeal site's corner location, and its visibility in a range of views along Goldsborough Crescent.
9. It has been put to me that, were the proposal to feature a lower ridge line, a large flat roof dormer would be required which may look more harmful. Be that as it may, this matter does not outweigh the harm that I have identified as a result of the proposal before me.
10. I have had regard to other two storey side projections which exist on Goldsborough Crescent. However, based on the available evidence, these appear to have a different scale to the appeal proposal and do not have roof forms which are not subservient or hipped. They are therefore not directly comparable. In any event, their existence does not indicate that the proposed development is acceptable.
11. Parking to the front of properties is a characteristic of Goldsborough Crescent, and a significant number of properties within this stretch of the road have hardstanding space for two vehicles to park side by side. Consequently, the hardstanding proposed to the front of the appeal site would not harm the character of the area.
12. However, I conclude that due to its dominant and unbalancing effect, the two storey side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies CS13 and CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) (CS) and Policies DM4, DM23 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan – Development Management Policies (2013) (DMP). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other aspects, that all new development is of a high standard of design and respects local character. As set out above, the design would also conflict with the SPD guidance in relation to the design of side extensions.

Surface water drainage

13. The Council consider that alterations to the front driveway are an integral part of the appeal proposal. Whilst this is not included in the applicant's description of development, the application form and block plan indicate the intention to increase the hardstanding to the front of the property to provide an additional car parking space.
14. Whilst not included in the reason for refusal, Policy DM34 of the DMP is referenced in the officer report. This suggests that greenfield run-off rates should be achieved through the maximisation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems where possible. However, on the basis of the evidence before me, I agree with the appellant that further landscaping details, which could include details of surface water drainage, could be adequately dealt with through the use of conditions.
15. Therefore, on this issue, I conclude that the proposal would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and, as such, it would not conflict with Policy CS15 of the CS and Policy DM29 and DM34 of the DMP insofar as they require proposals to incorporate high quality design to create a sustainable environment throughout Waltham Forest, and to maximise sustainable drainage where possible.

Other Matters

16. The appellant states that the property's interior is in a dangerous structural condition and near total reconstruction is required internally. The proposals will enable the appellant to bring a vacant property back into use as a family dwelling. Be that as it may, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
17. I acknowledge that the appellant is frustrated with the Council's handling of the proposal. However, I must determine the appeal on the basis of the drawings and information which I have before me.

Conclusion

18. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR