



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2025

by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/24/3350719

28 Lyne Crescent, London E17 5HZ

- 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 Mr Aurel Nazmiu against the decision of Waltham Forest London Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 241565.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two storey side extension..
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. On 12 December 2024, an updated National Planning Policy Framework was published. I have had regard to this as an important material consideration.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling standing on the inside corner of an L-shaped residential street of generally consistent two storey dwellings in stock brick with ground floor bay windows. The semi-detached pair addresses the corner at a roughly 45 degree angle to the terraces extending along each limb of the street. The front corner of each dwelling aligns with the front elevations of the adjoining terraces, maintaining a continuous front building line along the whole street on this side. The pair is also notable for having their main entrance doors located on the side elevations, highlighted by attractive timber porticos.
5. The two storey side extension would infill much of the space between the appeal dwelling and No 30, adding significantly to the size of the dwelling and extending to just over 1 metre from the site boundary and around 2 metres from the side wall of No 30. This would be an overbearing scale of development with the building appearing squeezed onto the site in a cramped manner. The minimal difference in roof height and modest setback of the extension from the main front elevation would also result in a lack of subordination and legibility of the original dwelling.
6. Moreover, the extension would stand forward of the front building line of the adjacent terrace from No 30 onwards, creating a conspicuous and anomalous interruption to the original building line of the street. This would be plainly visible in views when approaching the site from the south. Together, these factors would

severely undermine the positive contribution of the dwelling to the consistent scale and pattern of development in the street.

7. The extension would also severely erode the symmetrical appearance of the semi-detached pair in terms of overall scale and also as it would result in the regrettable loss of the attractive side entrance door and portico to an underwhelming, front facing door set back from the main front building line and lacking any architectural embellishment to match other dwellings in the street. I accept that the proposal seeks to match the existing brickwork of the building, but this would not compensate for an overall lack of design quality and failure to respect the prevailing characteristics of the surroundings.
8. The appellant refers to a number of purportedly similar extensions. The nearest of these at 67 Lyne Crescent stands adjacent to another extended dwelling at 4 Williams Avenue in a more varied street scene. The corresponding dwelling across the junction at 56 Williams Avenue has also been historically extended, lending an unintentional symmetry. However, these are isolated examples which have resulted in unbalanced semi-detached pairs and disrupted building lines. I do not regard them as exemplar developments to be followed and they do not alter my findings on the proposal, which are based on its particular site circumstances.
9. Elsewhere, the extension at 49 Millfield Avenue is to an end-of-terrace property and not comparable in its effects on symmetry or building lines. I have no details of the circumstances of the extension at Mount Pleasant Road, but I note a markedly wider separation from the adjacent terrace and more spacious relationship retained compared to the appeal proposal. As above, these examples do not alter my findings on the appeal scheme.
10. Therefore, for the reasons set out, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy 53 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1 (2024) and Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) which together require development to achieve high quality design which reinforces and/or enhances local character and distinctiveness, including by responding appropriately to context in terms of scale, massing, architecture, urban form and grain.

Other Matter

11. The Council did not refuse permission in respect of neighbours' living conditions. Having regard to the location of the extension, and the position and orientation of neighbours' windows and external spaces, I agree that the proposal would not cause demonstrable harm in these respects. However, the absence of harm in this respect is a neutral factor weighing neither for nor against the proposal.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would result in conflict with the development plan, taken as a whole. Other material considerations, namely very limited economic and social benefits of upgrading the housing stock, do not outweigh this conflict. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

K Savage

INSPECTOR