



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2024

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/23/3331784

207 Sinclair Road, Waltham Forest, Chingford E4 8PS

- 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 Ramon Jose against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref: 231139, dated 5 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is construction of a single storey ground floor rear extension together with extension of the main roof. Construction of three side dormer window extensions and installation of three roof lights to the side and rear roof slopes. Removal of existing rear garden structures and construction of a single storey rear garden outbuilding and associated hard/soft landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a single storey ground floor rear extension together with extension of the main roof. Construction of three side dormer window extensions and installation of three roof lights to the side and rear roof slopes. Removal of existing rear garden structures and construction of a single storey rear garden outbuilding and associated hard/soft landscaping at 207 Sinclair Road, Waltham Forest, Chingford E4 8PS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 231139, dated 5 May 2023, and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this permission.
 2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those in the existing building.
 3. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: RJ.01.Planning - Existing and Proposed Block Plans (dated 05/05/2023), RJ.03.Planning (Rev.A) - Proposed Ground Floor (dated 06/06/2023), RJ.05.Planning - Proposed Roof & Loft/Mezzanine (dated 05/05/2023), RJ.06.Planning - Elevation A-A (East Side) (dated 05/05/2023), RJ.07.Planning - Elevation B-B (West Side) (dated 05/2023), RJ.10.Planning (Rev.A) - Trees (West Side) (dated 05/05/2023) and Design and Access Statement (Rev.A) (dated 06/06/2023).

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a small bungalow located at the end of a row of three other bungalows in a residential area. It is also next to a pair of two storey semi-detached houses. Other dwellings in the road vary in house type and design, including short rows of terraced houses, detached and semi-detached houses. The appellant has explained that the ground floor of the property is cramped with all rooms served by a central dark corridor. The proposal would upgrade the standard of accommodation at the bungalow by re-arranging the ground floor layout. An ensuite bedroom and study would be provided in the loft space. It is intended that the thermal efficiency of the building would also be improved.
4. The Council has raised no objection to the removal of the existing garden structures, construction of the single storey outbuilding and associated landscaping. I see no reason to disagree as the outbuilding would replace an existing outbuilding and would be of an appropriate scale and design. It would cause no harm to the amenity of neighbours.
5. The Council considers that the proposed outbuilding and extensions would cause no harm to the amenity of neighbours. I concur with this finding because of the separation distance of the appeal building from the adjacent dwellings and the screening effect of boundary structures and vegetation.
6. The three adjacent bungalows vary in their form, design, and height, and partly through extensions. The adjacent bungalow at 205 Sinclair Road is orientated with its widest elevation next to the road. The appeal building has its front elevation facing Sinclair Road and appears relatively small and narrow in comparison with the other bungalows, when viewed from the road. The proposal would involve raising the ridge height of the appeal building by around 0.6 metres, which would make it comparable in height to the adjacent bungalow. The appellant has explained that this would allow the proposal to provide adequate ceiling heights and comply with the Building Regulations. The original features of the front elevation facing Sinclair Road would be retained.
7. Roof dormers to bungalows in the vicinity include a side dormer at 203 Sinclair Road, and two side dormers at 170 Sinclair Road. The proposed dormers at the appeal building would be relatively narrow in width, being around two metres and 1.6 metres wide at the western roof slope and approximately 1.6 metres wide on the eastern roof slope. They would all be set down by around 0.4 metres from the roof ridge and set up from the eaves by around 0.2 metres. The first dormer on the eastern roof slope would be set back from the front building line by around 9.5 metres, and the western roof dormer set back by around 5.5 metres. Although this would affect the symmetry of the bungalow when viewed from the road, the set-backs would reduce the visual impact of the dormers, particularly as the front elevation of the bungalow is already set back by around 7 metres from the footway of Sinclair Road.

8. In view of the particular circumstances of the building, being in a row of bungalows of differing form and design, and next to a two storey semi-detached dwelling, I consider that the increase in roof height and dormer extensions would be acceptable as they would not allow overlooking of neighbours or adversely affect the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. They would also be set down from the new roof ridge, as indicated in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document.
9. The proposal would therefore fail to conflict with policy CS15 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan-Core Strategy or policies DM4 and DM29 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Development Management Policies, all of which seek good quality design in relation to the context and character of the surrounding area and to respect the streetscene and local distinctiveness.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard condition for commencement of development a condition is imposed to confirm the approved drawings. A condition is added to require the use of matching external materials in order to ensure that the proposal respects the character and appearance of the building and streetscene.

Conclusion

11. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR