



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: 18 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/W/25/3366926

39 and 41, and, 49 and 51 Bedford Road, London E17 4PX

- 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 Kieren, Angela, Imogen and Theo, Morgan, McDermot, Chapman and Bamber against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application reference is 242650.
 - The development proposed is the construction of dormer roof extensions to main rear roofs together with raising the ridge height of the main roofs and installation of one roof-light to front roofs at 39 - 41 and 49 - 51 Bedford Road, Walthamstow, London, E17 4PX.
-

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 local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal properties form part of a terrace of 7 similar 2-storey dwellings. From what I saw, this terrace is free of any roof level extensions, and it has a consistent and uniform ridge line. These features positively contribute to the broad coherence and group value of the terrace. While I acknowledge the appellants' evidence and the views of several interested parties that buildings further along Bedford Road and nearby streets vary in height, style and size, this run of properties presents a uniform element within that varied built context, which is locally distinctive.
4. The proposed development would raise the ridges of the 2 end pairs of properties within the terrace by about 800mm. Despite the appellants' intention to create a symmetrical 'bookend' effect and to broadly align with the ridge height of the non-attached property at 91 Bedford Road, this increase would break the established and consistent ridgeline of the host terrace. The resultant stepped profile would appear incongruous and disruptive when viewed against the central, unaltered properties within the terrace, thereby harming the unity of this cohesive group. That impression would be evident from various vantage points along Bedford Road.
5. A dormer extension is also proposed on the extended rear roof slope of each appeal dwelling. While this element of the appeal scheme has been refined from earlier proposals to incorporate smaller windows and setbacks from the ridge and

eaves of the host roof, the new dormers would, by their combined bulk and scale, visually accentuate the increased mass of the raised roof structures.

6. From public viewpoints within Lloyd Park, beyond the rear of the appeal properties, the proposed dormers and raised ridgelines would draw the eye given the altered scale, mass and height of the appeal dwellings and the abrupt contrast with the unaltered form of the central dwellings within the terrace. The use of high-quality external materials, while commendable, would not mitigate the harm to the established character and appearance of the local area.
7. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it conflicts with Policies D1 and D4 of The London Plan and Policy 53 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1. Taken together, these policies promote high quality design and seek to ensure that new development reinforces and/or enhances local character and responds appropriately to their context.
8. The proposal is also at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that development should be sympathetic to local character, including the prevailing pattern of development. It also notes that the support given to upward extensions is conditional upon the development being consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene. For the reasons given, that would not be the case here.
9. I have considered all other matters raised, including the appellants response to the Council's pre-application advice; the absence of objections from others; the letters of support from interested parties; and the encouragement given by Government for homeowners to extend their properties. Once in place, the proposal would provide additional accommodation for the occupiers of each dwelling that would enhance their living conditions. The proposal makes efficient use of the space available within each property. The significance of the nearby Conservation Area as a heritage asset would be preserved and there would be no adverse effect on the amenity of others. However, these considerations are insufficient to outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.
10. The appellants also state that if there was sufficient headroom within the roof space of each dwelling then the proposal could come forward through the exercise of permitted development rights. Nevertheless, planning permission is sought and I have assessed the proposal on that basis.

Conclusion

11. Overall, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR