
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/25/3366717

10 Swansland Gardens, Waltham Forest, Walthamstow E17 5PD

- 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 Daniel Geneen against the decision of Waltham Forest London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 250600.
 - The development proposed is described as a rear roof loft conversion with front facing rooflights.
-

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 Matters and Main Issue

3. The description above is taken from the application form. It differs from the decision notice although part of the text has been cut off and is not therefore fully readable. The appeal form refers to the construction of a dormer roof extension to the main rear roof, together with the installation of four roof lights to the front roof slope. Nevertheless, neither party would be prejudiced by me referring to it in the above terms.
4. The Officer report refers to the proposed dormer roof extension implying that they do not object to the installation of roof lights on the front roof slope. I have no reason to disagree, and my recommendation focusses on the same. Specifically, its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a mid-terrace property. To the front and rear, the properties have a simple design and appearance that is repeated across the relatively small terrace. There is a terrace opposite the appeal property that is of the same layout which gives an attractive symmetry to the street scene in a triangular shape. Some of the properties have been subject to alterations, but this has not, on the whole, adversely affected the consistency of the dwellings either individually or as a collective. All of these factors combine to create a pleasant sense of uniformity to the area.

6. The proposal would introduce a substantial block to the roof of the rear of the property that would negatively draw the eye. The dormer would be large and disproportionate to the roof slope and would stand out unacceptably. Not only would such a feature be alien to the terrace, but it would also disrupt the uniformity of the terrace groups and would thus cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies D4 of the London Plan 2021 and 53 of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Local Plan 2024 which are concerned with patterns of development amongst other things.

Other Matters

8. Although I do not have the specific history of the examples provided, it is worth noting that other dormers are an exception to the norm that do not sufficiently change the character as I have identified it above. There are no such developments in the same terrace. I am not therefore led to recommending allowing the appeal.
9. The scheme would provide more space for the family of the appellant, but this would be a private benefit, and it is unclear as to whether or not it could be achieved by other less harmful means. This would not therefore be sufficient against the harms I have found. The living conditions of neighbours is not a contentious matter in the appeal. A lack of harm in this regard would in any event be a neutral matter which would be incapable of weighing in favour of the proposals. The same can be said for the lack of a neighbouring objection.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR