



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

### Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4<sup>th</sup> September 2025

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/25/3365608

### 32 Nevin Drive, Chingford, London, E4 7LH

- 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 Lucy Holt and James Bishop against the decision of Waltham Forest London Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 250195.
  - The development proposed is a replacement of existing single-storey garage and utility room with a two-storey side extension, a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension and dormer loft conversion including solar panels to flat roof.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure, Preliminary Matter & Main Issue

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.
3. The description on the application form differs to the decision notice. However, I am satisfied that the original description accurately describes the appeal development and is therefore reflected above.
4. The Council have raised no objections to the two-storey side and rear extension, and this is mirrored by the previous planning permissions which appear to have been implemented based on the site visit. I have no reason to disagree with their conclusions. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the dormer element on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal building is a pair of semi-detached dwellings fronting a residential street. Whilst there are differences in the materials used along the street as well as some being previously extended, the buildings are consistent in their form and largely plain roofscapes. Moreover, typically buildings in this location have a reducing window hierarchy from the ground floor upwards. All of which lend a pleasant originality to built form that resultantly contributes positively to the visual qualities of the area.
6. The proposed dormer would span the majority of the original roofscape along with it encroaching into the extended roof. This in combination with the already approved elements would be large and obvious, subsuming the resultant roof. Even being set in from the chimney and set above the eaves, it would not be seen as being

proportionate to the dwelling in terms of its overall scale. Moreover, it would unbalance the dwelling and not follow the natural window hierarchy which would create a top-heavy impression to the rear. Resultantly, its presence would erode the largely unaltered qualities of the area in these regards. Whilst it would not be seen on the street scene, the extension would be from neighbouring gardens. It's lack of public obviousness would not make it acceptable.

7. The Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions and Alterations 2010 (SPD) focusses on whether the proportions of the extension are appropriate. Whilst I appreciate that the SPD is of some age and older than the current iteration of the permitted development regime, it is still a material consideration as this proposal was for express planning permission. For the above reasons, the appeal scheme would not sit squarely with the SPD.
8. I appreciate that there are some examples of dormer windows in the vicinity, however I have not been provided any further details or their planning status. The appellant advises that they could build some form of the dormer window under the permitted development regime. Whilst I don't doubt that they can build something, I am not convinced that there is enough evidence to substantiate this claim to suggest the proposal itself would fall under permitted development criteria. I therefore cannot give any more than limited weight to these considerations.
9. With the above in mind, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, there would be conflict with Policy 53 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan (2024) and Policy D1 of the London Plan (2021). These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

### **Other Matters**

10. I understand that there are some errors in the Council's report surrounding the acceptability of the proposal. However, it is clear from the majority of the body of the report and the refusal reason that they object to the development. I have considered the appeal accordingly.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan and I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*E Street*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*John Morrison*

INSPECTOR