



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 April 2025 by M Jones

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12TH August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/25/3359594

1 Warwick Road, Waltham Forest, Walthamstow, E17 5NP

- 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 Waltham Forest Council against the decision of Waltham Forest Council.
 - The application Ref is 242239.
 - The development proposed is to install External Wall Insulation to the front side and rear elevations, this consists of a 90mm Mineral Wool EWI system to be applied to the solid external walls, finished in a silicon off white coloured render.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of the proposed works in the banner heading above has been shortened from what was submitted on the application form to omit unnecessary information for the purposes of accurately describing the proposed scheme.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey end of terrace property situated on Warwick Road in Walthamstow. The local area is made up of quiet suburban roads featuring small rows of terraced dwellings which have a broadly similar scale, age and cottage-style appearance as well as a number of semi-detached dwellings.
6. The properties in the terrace on which the appeal dwelling sits have a uniform and balanced appearance with the same brickwork, which includes attractive and distinctive brick detailing above the front doors and ground floor windows, and similar fenestration and roof treatments.
7. The drawings provided are very rudimentary, however it appears from the drawing and description of the proposed works submitted that the installation of the

insulation would fully cover and obscure the original brickwork. Therefore, this attractive material and the detailing of the appeal dwelling would be lost, which would disrupt the uniform appearance of dwellings on the terrace. The appeal dwelling's prominent end-of-terrace position means that the insulation to the front and side elevations would be clearly visible from the public street which would heighten the proposal's visual impact.

8. Consequently, the proposed insulation to the front and side elevations would be an incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the appeal dwelling which would harm its character and appearance as well as that of the other dwellings in the terrace and the visual amenity of the streetscape.
9. Further, the drawing submitted is basic and lacks detail on how the insulation would be installed particularly at the corners of the appeal dwelling and over the windows and doors. It also does not give a clear impression of the extent of the protrusion of the insulation relative to the neighbouring property. There is also no supporting information demonstrating how or if the insulation considers the existing architectural detailing of the appeal dwelling.
10. It is therefore unclear how the proposed development would be installed and how it would appear thereafter. If installed poorly, it could result in a further harmful impact to the appearance of the appeal property and neighbouring properties. Given this uncertainty, I am unable to recommend the approval of the insulation to the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling even if this would be acceptable in principle given it is not visible from the public street.
11. The appellant has stated that the main purpose of the proposed development is to improve the energy efficiency of the appeal dwelling to help residents reduce energy bills. However, the appellant has not provided detail on the dwelling's current energy efficiency performance and has not quantified the improvement that the proposed development would bring in terms of energy efficiency and associated reduction in bills. In the absence of this detail, I can only give this submission limited weight in my assessment. For the reasons outlined above, the harm that would be caused by the proposed development would therefore outweigh the unquantified sustainability related benefits.
12. The appellant also refers to a property in the local area that has had similar insulation installed on its front, side and rear elevations. However, from visiting the site, it is apparent that the context is different in that case. The property referred to is a semi-detached dwelling with a different design, form and layout and so cannot be directly compared to the appeal dwelling, where being part of a largely uniform terrace is a key element of its character and appearance.
13. The appellant also refers to houses down the street which have changed their appearances through different rendering, window treatments as well as the addition of extensions and porches to suggest there is a precedent for alterations in the local area. However, in the case of the terraced row on which the appeal dwelling is sited, there is broad uniformity in appearance and style which is a key element of the character and appearance of these dwellings. As such, any proposal which would alter this element is likely to have a more harmful effect than the same proposal may have elsewhere.
14. In any event, planning decisions are determined on their own merits and do not set a precedent for other decisions. Even putting aside the differences in context, the

fact that there are examples of external wall insulation and other alterations in the wider local area does not outweigh or nullify the harm the proposed development would cause to both the appeal dwelling and street scene.

15. For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and local area and so would not comply with Policy 53 of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1 2020-2035 (adopted 2024) which requires that development proposals reinforce local character and respond appropriately to their context.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Jones

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR