



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/25/3369580

4 Randolph Road, Walthamstow E17 9NR

- 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 Ms Lesley Hynes against the decision of Waltham Forest London Borough Council.
 - The application ref. is 242150.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing two-storey side extension and erection of two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and replacement boundary fencing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the:
 - character and appearance of the Orford Road Conservation Area, and
 - living conditions of the occupiers of 5 Randolph Road and 33, 33a and 35 Wingfield Road, with regard to outlook, overbearing and enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The site is located within the Orford Road Conservation Area (CA), the character or appearance of which I am required by section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing.
4. The appeal site is one of a pair of triangular plots on the outside of a right-angled street corner. It contains a semi-detached Victorian cottage in London stock brick with a concrete-tiled dual pitched roof, timber sash windows and decorative bargeboards. Its front gable is set some way in from the street and faces diagonally to a narrow frontage between neighbouring pairs of cottages.
5. Other cottages in the same style front squarely to the street, those to the north are set in slightly from the pavement and the pair to the east are built up to it. The pair on and adjoining the appeal site are uniquely oriented. Like others, they have an original single-storey rear outrigger but, unlike them, they have two-storey flat-roofed extensions on the additional space to their sides.
6. The extension on the appeal site steps out from the side and is set back from the front. The orientation of the cottage and proximity of 5 Randolph Road mean that

- views of the extension are restricted to a narrow section of the street. From rear gardens and windows of neighbouring houses, the extension, outrigger and an outbuilding alongside the garden fence are all visible to varying degrees.
7. Whilst this section of Randolph Road is uniform in form, style, and materials, the CA's significance lies in its mix of early Victorian buildings that predate the denser and more uniform development of wider areas. Whilst the CA Appraisal does not refer to it, I agree with the Council's Conservation Officer that the cottage, with its timber sash windows and decorative bargeboards, contributes positively.
 8. The proposal would replace the side extension and outrigger with larger versions in lighter brick, all with flat roofs. Parapets would be slightly higher for the side and just below the party wall for the rear extension. The outbuilding would be removed, and a further single storey timber clad extension built behind the side extension and alongside the nearest two-thirds of the replacement for the outrigger.
 9. The ground floor side window would be moved forward to accommodate the larger side extension, the timber sash windows in the main cottage replaced with double glazed ones of the same style and materials, and the concrete roof tiles replaced with artificial slate. The doors and windows in the extensions would be modern in appearance with grey powder coated aluminium frames.
 10. The Council considers the proposal too dominant and bulky, the rear extensions overly complicated and the totality an overdevelopment. Its Conservation Officer considers that the aluminium windows would harm the character of the cottage. Neighbours also consider the resulting loss of outlook, overbearing and increased enclosure would be out of character with the CA.
 11. The side extension would be closer to the street. Therefore, a slightly greater width and height of broadly characteristic brickwork would be visible from a somewhat larger section of the street. This would not harm the character or appearance of the cottage or CA, but the greater visibility of an uncharacteristic parapet and reduction in width of what is a unique gap would.
 12. Whilst various built forms and uncharacteristic windows are already visible from rear gardens and windows of neighbouring houses, the proposed further variation of form, windows and materials, would neither preserve nor enhance character or appearance in these respects. Whilst I note the intention to break up massing and the lack of public visibility, the effect would still be harmful.
 13. I also note the examples at 5 Randolph Road and 70A Beulah Road. The former offers an indication of typical scale and proximity in the same visual environment. However, the latter has a different and more varied context, its windows effecting a transition between the traditional features of a Victorian corner shop and a modern apartment block at Amey Court on Grosvenor Rise East.
 14. Beyond the above effects, I do not consider the amount of development proposed inherently harmful. The replacement of roof tiles with slate, albeit artificial, would improve the appearance of the cottage and its contribution to the character of the CA. The replacement of timber sash windows with double glazed equivalents would preserve the character and appearance of the cottage and CA.
 15. Overall, the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the cottage and the Orford Road CA. The energy efficiency benefits

of replacing timber sash windows with double glazed versions of the same and the appearance benefits of artificial slate compared to the existing roof tiles, whilst both public, do not outweigh the harm I have found.

16. This would be contrary to Policies 53, 70 and 72 of the adopted Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1 (2024), which require proposals to reinforce or enhance local character and distinctiveness, giving great weight to harm to designated heritage assets, and requiring clear and convincing justification of any such harm. I attach significant weight to these conflicts with policy.

Living conditions

17. The slightly taller side and single storey timber-clad extensions would be closer to the boundaries than the existing structures but would remain diagonally oriented with respect to them. The extensions would therefore appear larger from the rear gardens and windows of properties on Wingfield Road and from the rear garden of 5 Randolph Road and increase enclosure somewhat.
18. However, the orientation of the proposed extensions would reduce the sense of overbearing or enclosure to an acceptable level. Indeed, removal of the outbuilding alongside the boundary with 35 Wingfield Road would reduce enclosure to the end of its rear garden. Whilst the upper corner of the replacement timber-clad extension would then be visible, it would be set further away.
19. Only the uppermost rear corner of the two-storey side extension would obscure an area of sky as seen from the rear gardens and ground floor doors and windows of Wingfield Road, so that the loss of outlook or light to these would be acceptable. In respect of no.5, most of the bulk created would be alongside its side extension, in which there are only rooflights, limiting impact to its garden.
20. Overall, the degree of enclosure would remain broadly consistent with the context and the limited loss of outlook would be acceptable. Consequently, I find that there would be no harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 5 Randolph Road and of 33, 33a and 35 Wingfield Road and therefore no conflict with the Policy 57 of the of the adopted Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1 (2024).

Other Matters

21. The appellant states that the proposed development would provide necessary additional accommodation for an aging couple. I have had regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty and recognise that this could minimise disadvantage due to age. This represents a public benefit to which I attach modest weight, but which does not outweigh the harm I have found to character and appearance.
22. In addition to the impacts that the Council is concerned about, neighbours on Wingfield Road are also concerned about the loss of light to their rear gardens. However, this would not be significant for the reasons given above regarding outlook in respect of daylight, but also due to the location of the proposal to the east or north-east of these receptors in respect of sunlight.
23. One neighbour is also concerned that some of these effects might harm the value of their property; however, this is not a material consideration.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR