



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2025

by N Bowden BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/W/25/3365832

48B Harrington Road, Leytonstone, Waltham Forest E11 4QW

- 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 Emma Pritchard against the decision of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref is 242577.
 - The development proposed is an L shape dormer, loft conversion, internal alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an L shape dormer, loft conversion, internal alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works at 48B Harrington Road, Leytonstone, Waltham Forest E11 4QW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 242577, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with plan nos. Location plan dated 21 October 2024, B261473-1100 Rev A dated October 2024, B261473-3000 Rev A dated October 2024, B261473-3100 Rev B dated October 2024.
 - 3) The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building and shall thereafter be retained as such for the lifetime of the development.
 - 4) Rooflights shall not project outwards more than 150mm from the existing roof plane.

Preliminary Matters

2. An amended plan was provided with the appeal that changed the annotation of a room in the loft space from 'bedroom 3' to 'office'. This does not fundamentally change the nature of what permission has been sought for and, given that it is only a change in annotation and that the Council has commented upon it, I am satisfied that there would be no procedural unfairness in my taking account of this amendment.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:

- 1) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, and
- 2) whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupants, having particular regard to the size and dimensions of a room in the loft space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Number 48B Harrington Road comprises an end terrace, two storey home constructed in a mixture of red and London stock bricks with bay window and mock Tudor gable. It is typical of the late Victorian to early Edwardian vernacular and shares these characteristics with many neighbouring houses along this and surrounding streets. The original house has been converted into two flats.
5. The proposal seeks permission to construct a box dormer window in the rear roof slope, and this would extend in a broad L shape into a rear projecting outrigger. The dormer would allow the use of the loft space as living accommodation for the upper floor flat.
6. The box dormer would be relatively large and almost completely fill the rear roof slope of the house. Furthermore, it would extend around the rear element and into the outrigger. This would disrupt the line of the roof slope and be visible and quite prominent in the street scene due to its corner location. However, I must be mindful that it is not dissimilar in size or style to other such box dormers in the area. These are apparent along surrounding streets including Harold Road and Vernon Road. Most notably this includes the one constructed relatively recently at 46 Harrington Road on the opposing corner. I have noted comments relating to whether this neighbouring dormer was constructed in accordance with the approved details. Regardless, even if there is indeed a divergence from the approved plans, a similar dormer was nevertheless permitted.
7. By comparison, this proposal occupies a lesser proportion of the roof slope, being set below the main ridge of the roof and it does not extend the full way into the rear outrigger. I accept this proposal represents one of the more prominent dormer examples but, in this context, I am unable to conclude that it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, I find that the proposal complies with policy 53 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan 2024 (WFLP) insofar as its design responds appropriately to its context in terms of scale, height, and massing.

Living conditions

8. The Council has expressed concern that a loft room, annotated as bedroom 3 on the original plans, would be of an insufficient size to accord with the minimum floor areas prescribed in the London Plan (LP) and the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). I agree with this assessment.

9. However, an amended plan indicates that this room would be used as an office. There are two further rooms annotated to be used as bedrooms which are compliant with the LP and NDSS. It is not unreasonable to expect a two bedroom flat to incorporate a home office. Moreover, the space standard for the property as a two bedroom home exceeds the other floorspace requirements of both the LP and NDSS. In this context I am satisfied that it would be used as an office.
10. Therefore, I find that the proposal would provide satisfactory internal living space for the residents and would therefore comply with policy 57 of the WFLP insofar as it respects the amenity of existing and future occupiers.

Conditions

11. I have imposed the conditions suggested by the Council in the event the appeal is to be allowed with edits and modifications to accord with the Planning Practice Guidance. A general time limit condition is imposed to accord with the provisions of the Act and a condition on adherence to the approved plans for certainty. Conditions on materials and to limit the projection of the rooflights are imposed in the interest of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. The proposal complies with the provisions of the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate a decision should be made other than accordance with it. The appeal is allowed.

N Bowden

INSPECTOR