

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2024

by C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/24/3339627

159 Fyfield Road, Waltham Forest, Walthamstow E17 3RA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Bee Bee Meeajun against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref is 232822.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing conservatory and construction of part single (sic) part double storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council adopted the Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1 2020-2035 (2024) (LP) on 29 February 2024 and it is now part of the development plan. The Council has confirmed that in the light of the adoption of the Local Plan the policy context has changed and its reason for refusal should relate to Policy 53 of the Local Plan and Waltham Forest Supplementary Planning Document – ‘Residential Extensions and Alterations’ (2010) only. On this basis I have regarded the other plans and policies referred to in the Council’s decision notice as superseded.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The site is located in a suburban residential area comprised of brick-built, front rendered, terraced housing with small front gardens or driveways. The original property has been extended by a dormer roof extension and single-storey lean-to extension, both of which run across the whole rear width of the property. The host property sits within a terrace and has a long rear garden which slopes gradually downwards towards the railway line forming the boundary of the site.
5. Several properties along the terrace have also been extended to the rear and have large dormer extensions. Although there is a variety to the style of these

extensions, as they are broadly of similar scale there is a regularity to their appearance.

6. The proposed two-storey element, despite being of a reduced width in comparison with the single storey element would have an overbearing impact on the original appearance of the dwelling. The proposed flat roof extension would run into the eaves of the host property almost meeting the bottom of the dormer extension, which would create an incongruous, stepped appearance to the rear of the property. The cumulative impact of the proposed changes would be out of scale with the original character of the property and therefore over dominate its appearance.
7. I noted from my site visit that two-storey rear extensions are not a key character of the local area. The proposal would disrupt the uniform appearance of the terrace, whilst the stepped form of the proposal would have a discordant appearance, causing harm to the character of the surrounding area.
8. The appellant has brought my attention to similar developments at 46 and 48 Greenway. I have no details of these schemes before me including the circumstances which led to the permission being granted. Therefore, I cannot be confident that they are directly comparable to the appeal scheme.
9. Although the proposal has been designed to prevent loss of daylight to the occupiers of neighbouring properties and would provide additional living space for occupiers, this does not outweigh the significant harm identified above.
10. For the reasons outlined above the proposed alterations would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with Policy 53 of the LP and the SPD, which seek amongst other things to ensure new development is of a high-quality design which reinforces local character and distinctiveness.

Conclusion

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR