



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by R Aston BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/25/3361444

25 Woodville Road, Walthamstow, London, E17 7ER

- 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 S Waite against the decision of Waltham Forest London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 242705.
 - The development proposed is construction of a part single storey and part two storey rear extension at ground and first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a part single storey and part two storey rear extension at ground and first floor level at 25 Woodville Road, London, E17 7ER in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 242705, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos. GLA-01L, GLA-02L, GLA-03L, GLA-04L, GLA-05L, GLA-06L, GLA-07L.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.
 - 4) The first floor rear window serving the bathroom shall be glazed with obscure glass to a level equivalent to Pilkington Level 3 or above (or nearest equivalent standard) and shall have a restrictive opening system allowing a maximum opening of 10cm. The window shall be retained in that form thereafter.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties at no. 23 and 27 Woodville Road with particular regard to outlook, privacy and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a two storey, mid terraced dwelling with a single storey outrigger situated within a predominately residential area. To the rear boundary of the site is a school and children's centre. Several of the dwellings along Woodville Road have been extended over time, including rear single and two storey extensions. The rear elevation of the appeal dwelling is stepped back from that of neighbouring dwelling at no.27.
5. The proposed single storey extension would extend the full width of the plot, infilling an area of outdoor space to the side of the existing outrigger. Similar full width rear single storey extensions have occurred along Woodville Road.

No.23 Woodville Road

Outlook

6. The Residential Extensions and Alterations (February 2010) SPD refers to rear extensions on 'L shaped' dwellings and states that squaring the property off by infilling the L shape can create a 'tunnel effect' for the neighbour and therefore be too overbearing. However, if the directly affected neighbour has extended their house in the same way, it may be acceptable to infill the L shape providing sufficient natural light and ventilation can be achieved internally. It further acknowledges that the height of single storey rear extensions should be kept as low as possible on the boundary to avoid unacceptable impact.
7. The appeal proposal would have a mono pitch roof with the lower end of the roof at an eaves height of 2.5 metres, adjoining a parapet wall on the boundary with no.23. Although the proposal would be higher than the existing boundary fence and therefore would be more notably visible from no.23, the monopitch roof would reduce the bulk and visual impact minimising the overbearing and tunnelling effects upon the occupants of the neighbouring dwelling.
8. The proposed single storey extension would be of a similar depth to the existing single storey extension at no.27 and would extend approximately 1 metre beyond the rear elevation of no.23. There is an external door on the rear wall of the dwelling of no.23 which provides access to the area of space to the side of the single storey outrigger. Whilst the space to the side of the outrigger is part of the garden, it provides a narrow passage into a wider garden area that extends past both the existing single storey outrigger of no.23 and the proposed extension. This wider part of the garden is more usable and likely to be enjoyed by users of garden space than the narrow passage of outdoor space to the side of the outrigger. Given the position of the proposed extension it would not significantly increase the sense of enclosure within the wider part of the neighbouring garden at no.23.

Light

9. The proposed extension due to its size and position would result in some reduction of light to the garden of no.23, particularly to the outdoor area to side of the outrigger. Light to the external door of the outrigger would also be restricted, however, I note there is a large bay window to the front of the property which would provide light for the downstairs accommodation. The main usable part of the rear garden would not be entirely overshadowed given the position and south facing

orientation of the proposed extension. Consequently, there would be no material erosion of the ability to use and occupy that space or similar.

No.27 Woodville Road

Privacy

10. The proposed first floor extension would provide a bathroom. It would extend partially over the footprint of the existing single storey outrigger. A single window is proposed on the rear elevation. If I were minded to allow the appeal, a condition could be imposed requiring the window to be obscured/frosted glazing in the interests of protecting privacy for the occupants of the appeal site and occupants/users of rear garden space for the neighbouring properties.

Outlook

11. Although the proposed extension would be visible from the first floor window of no.27 the impact on outlook would be limited given the setback position of the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling and the proposed modest depth of the first floor extension limiting the visual intrusion. The position of the first floor window of no.27 also does not sit directly on the boundary with the appeal site and therefore much of the existing outlook would be preserved.
12. I acknowledge there are inaccuracies in the submitted block and elevation plans relating to the neighbouring dwelling at no.27 in terms of its positioning and first floor fenestration. However, I carried out a site visit and my findings are therefore also based on my own observations.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in unacceptable impact on the living conditions for the occupiers of the neighbouring properties at no.23 and 27 with particular regard to outlook, privacy and light within the rear gardens and outlook from a first floor window serving no. 27 Woodville Road. Thus, it would comply with Policy 57 the London Borough of Waltham Forest Local Plan (2024) and the SPD which seeks amongst other matters to protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

14. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plan is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
15. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, a condition requiring the external materials of the extension to match those used in the existing building/dwelling is imposed.
16. A condition relating to the use of obscure glazing to the bathroom window is necessary for privacy.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. The proposal would accord with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the Framework do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

18. Having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

R Aston

INSPECTOR