



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/25/3359797

23 Epsom Road, Leyton, Waltham Forest, London E10 6ES

- 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 Rubina Mahmood against the decision of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Council.
 - The application Ref is 242272.
 - The development proposed is a single storey ground floor rear extension and two storey side extension .
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey ground floor rear extension and two storey side extension at 23 Epsom Road, Leyton, Waltham Forest, London E10 6ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 242272, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: D03, D04, D06, D08 and D09
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. Subsequent to the Council's decision, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) has been issued. However, I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issues in this appeal. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my decision with regard to the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey end of terrace house in brick with a painted finish. It is on a corner plot that narrows to the rear, which is located at the junction of Epsom Road with Cheltenham Road. To the side of the appeal dwelling is an

- existing single storey side extension, which is set slightly back from the front elevation and aligns with that of the rear and has a steep mono-pitch lean-to roof .
5. The proposal would replace this existing side extension with a two storey side extension and add a single storey side extension. This proposal is intended to overcome the reasons for refusal for a recent application¹ for a two storey rear and side extensions.
 6. The proposed side extension would extend as far sideways from the flank wall of the original house as the existing side extension, towards the street frontage of the appeal plot with Cumberland Road. At ground level it would align with the front and rear elevations of the original house, but the first floor level would be set back by approximately 1 metre from the front elevation, whilst aligning at the rear. A small mono pitch roof would sit above that part of the ground floor part of the extension that sits forward of the first floor part. The main roof of the proposed side extension would be hipped in form, with the rear roof slope aligning with that of the original house, whilst the front roof slope and roof ridge would be set well down from the existing.
 7. Although the ground floor of the proposed side extension would not be set back from the front elevation, the combination of the mono-pitch roof above the ground floor element, the 1m set back of the first floor and the hipped main roof above, would result a recessive appearance of the proposed side extension in relation to the front elevation or the original house. In combination with the set down of the roof ridge of the proposal, this would result in it appearing secondary and subordinate to the appeal dwelling. In this regard the proposed side extension would accord with the design guidance for side extensions set out in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (the SPD).
 8. The proposed flat roofed single storey rear extension would be to the full width of original house. This would also accord with the design guidance given in the SPD for such extensions and would appear as a visually recessive and discreet rear addition to the appeal dwelling.
 9. Due to the corner location of the appeal dwelling, the rear and side extensions are seen in conjunction and in the round in street views from Cheltenham Road. Whilst the proposal would result in a significantly enlarged house, the side and rear elements of the proposal present a well-designed combination and would not, therefore, appear to dominate the scale of the appeal dwelling or the terrace of which it forms part. As such, it would not appear as unduly prominent in these views, visually dominating or as an insubordinate form of development. Rather the proposal as a whole would present its additional bulk in well massed forms that would complement the design, form and scale of the original house and would represent a subordinate addition to the appeal dwelling.
 10. Whilst there appears to be little in the way of large extensions to dwellings in the terrace of which the appeal dwelling forms part or the immediate local area, the area is made up of residential properties in diverse forms and architectural styles with a wide age range. The streetscape of the local area is defined by this variety and the proposal, which would complement the scale and character of the original

¹ Planning Ref: 203812

house, would not be so large or visually assertive that it would result in it appearing as incongruous to this established local character and appearance.

11. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area. As such, it would accord with Policy 53 of the of the Waltham Forest Local Plan - LP1 (2024). This seeks development, including by that of extension, that is of high quality design, responds appropriately to context and takes into account local character and distinctiveness.

Conditions

12. Along with the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, I have attached conditions to ensure design quality that require compliance with the approved drawings and materials that match existing.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is allowed

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR