



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 September 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/25/3368315

27 Sky Peals Road, Woodford Green IG8 9NE

- 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 Olly Buck against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application reference is 250223.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an extension to front wall of ground floor side extension to align with the front wall of the main house. External wall insulation installed on front and rear elevations of the main house. Erection of new front porch, rear bay construction and level 01 roof extension. Proposed works also include roof alterations to facilitate roof extension, roof lights and a mixture of replacement and new windows and doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms one half of a semi-detached pair that share a 2-storey forward projection with a flat front wall and gable facing the road. Like many properties on Sky Peals Road, No. 27 has been enlarged and externally altered. These changes have disrupted the broad symmetry and sense of balance between the principal elevations of No 27 and its attached counterpart, 29 Sky Peals Road.
4. On Sky Peals Road, I saw that dwellings vary in style, type, size and general appearance. In some cases, buildings include front and side extensions, including those to which the appellant has referred and provided photographs. As such, the existing local built form is varied, as the appellant's detailed analysis confirms.
5. The Council raises no objection to the new rear extension, the rooflights and the proposed changes to the fenestration of No 27. From the submitted evidence, I see no reason to disagree. My assessment, therefore, focuses on the proposed front extensions and the installation of external wall insulation (EWI).

Front extensions

6. The proposal includes a single-storey front extension to form a porch with a flat roof, built in planter and external steps to the driveway. This new addition would project noticeably beyond the main front wall and occupy a prominent position to

one side of the built frontage. By disrupting the 2-storey flat façade and disturbing the generally balanced façade of the host building, the new porch would be an unsympathetic and obtrusive feature of the completed dwelling. It would draw attention from the road, even with partial screening from some vantage points provided by a nearby tree and among the varied built form along Sky Peals Road.

7. While other properties in the vicinity of the site include front porches none were directly comparable in scale and design to the proposal. In most cases, existing porches were generally smaller and appear as incidental features to their host building than would be the case with the appeal scheme. While larger single storey front projections were also evident, these have integrated with the host building and blended in with their street scene with differing degrees of success. Not all the cases necessarily set a desirable precedent to follow. Planting would not sufficiently mitigate this harmful visual impact.
8. The proposed two-storey front addition would infill a side recess and line up with the main front wall. Although it would increase the scale and mass of the dwelling and introduce a new flat-roof element, the front gable and flat façade shared with No 29 would remain legible. This element of the appeal scheme would visually accentuate the differences with No 29 and it would further imbalance the pair. Even so, it would relate reasonably well with the host building with the new 2-storey front elevation and roof form broadly resembling that of other properties near to the site, some of which form part of asymmetric pairs. In that context, the new 2-storey extension, in itself, would not result in significant visual disharmony. However, for the reasons given, the new porch would be an unwelcome addition even when seen with the proposed 2-storey extension in place.

External wall insulation

9. EWI is proposed for the front and rear elevations. Although the submitted material specifies the thickness of the EWI, it omits critical details such as the material type, finish, and the junctions with the openings and rooflines. Without these details, it is not possible to fully assess the visual impact of the EWI on the appearance of the host building or its effect within the wider streetscape.
10. It is regrettable that further details were not sought during the application process. However, national and local planning policies require proposals to be supported by adequate information. The lack of scaled section drawings and material specifications in this case prevents a full and proper assessment.
11. Given that EWI can significantly alter the building's appearance, these details are fundamental to the planning assessment. This is not a matter that can be left to a planning condition because the acceptability of the scheme depends on them.

Conclusion on the main issue

12. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. It therefore conflicts with Policy 53 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1. This policy promotes high design quality and requires development to reinforce and/or enhance local character.

Other matters

13. I recognise that EWI, once installed, would improve energy efficiency, sustainability and climate resilience and note that it has been installed at 28 Sky Peals Road with a render finish. However, planning policies require such alterations to be well designed and sympathetic to their context. From the information provided, I am unable to confirm that these outcomes would be achieved.
14. No objection is raised to the new rear extension, roof lights and fenestration changes. These elements are, however, not severable from the wider proposal, and I therefore cannot issue a split decision to grant permission solely for them.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. No material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, indicate that a different decision should be reached. For the reasons above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR