



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2024

by A Hartley, LLB(Hons), Solicitor, MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/24/3337203

20 Courtland Avenue, Waltham Forest, Chingford E4 6DU

- 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 Adam Placey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref is 230312.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey rear extension, hip to gable roof extension to the main roof, rear dormer roof extensions, installation of a dormer window and four roof-lights to the front roof slope and installation of replacement windows to the front and side elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Preliminary Issues

2. The description of development in the planning application form is "Loft conversion, single storey rear extension to this semi-detached bungalow". However, I have taken the description from the Notice of Decision in this case as it more clearly describes the appeal proposal.
3. Prior to determining the appeal, further comments were sought from the main parties in relation to the adoption of the new Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1 on 29 February 2024 (WFLP). Any further comments received have been taken into consideration in determining this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow, situated in an area characterised predominantly by dwellings of similar design. The appeal site is at the corner of Courtland Avenue and Rosslyn Avenue. The appeal plot is modest and there are existing domestic outbuildings within the rear garden.
6. The appeal property makes a positive contribution to the street scene by maintaining the symmetry of the overall building and rhythm of hipped roofscape that are distinct features of similar dwellings within the surrounding

- area. The existing extension does not impact on this symmetry within the street scene.
7. The appeal proposal would introduce a gable side roof at this prominent corner. Such design would be unacceptable as it would create an imbalance to the overall building as the other half of the semi-detached dwelling retains its hipped roof. The proposed rear dormer, despite being set in from the eaves and below the roof ridgeline, would appear top heavy in relation to the host property when considering the building as a whole, as the adjoining semi-detached dwelling retains the scale and design of the original bungalow.
 8. There are some other dwellings in the surrounding area with varied front dormers, however, they do not dominate the character of the street scene, in which small scale semi-detached bungalows with symmetry of design including hipped roofs predominate. Further, these examples are not in the immediate vista of the appeal site. The proposed front dormer would disrupt the existing dominant rhythm of the street scene to which the appeal proposal relates.
 8. Matching materials are proposed, and windows are proposed to align with those of the host dwelling. However, these design features do not overcome the increased imbalance to the overall buildings and the harm caused to the street scene and the host dwelling by virtue of its height and design at the corner location.
 9. My attention has been drawn to other extensions within the surrounding area. They are of differing designs and/or contexts. Their presence does not overcome my concerns with the appeal proposal in its context.
 10. My attention has also been drawn to a planning permission granted in 2019 reference 184329. I do not have full information regarding the circumstances in which the permission was granted. From my site visit observation, it does not appear to have been implemented – nor does the evidence before me state otherwise. If not implemented, it would have lapsed and therefore would not constitute a fall-back position. Although a material consideration, having regard to the limited information, I have given limited weight to this previous decision in my consideration of this appeal.
 11. I conclude that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area by virtue of its unacceptable design and inappropriate scale within its context.
 12. Accordingly, I find that the proposal conflicts with policy 53 of the WFLP, policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), the Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions and Alterations (2010) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), all of which seek high quality design appropriate to its context.

Planning Balance

13. The appeal proposal would provide additional living accommodation for the family and space to work from home. However, the harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area that the proposal would cause would outweigh these benefits. I therefore conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, that indicate my decision should be made otherwise.

Conclusion

14. Having taken into account all representations made, and for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR