



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2025

by **E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/25/3372488

29 Maynard Road, Walthamstow E17 9JE

- 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 Bostan Mohammad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Waltham Forest.
 - The application Ref is 251464.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as 'erection of single storey rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises the construction of a single storey wraparound rear extension and front bay window at ground floor level. The Council dealt with the proposal on that basis and so shall I.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 31 Maynard Road, with particular regard to daylight, sunlight and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property comprises a 2 storey terraced dwelling within an area which is residential in character. While there are a variety of architectural styles present in the vicinity of the appeal property, the part of the terrace of which it forms part exhibits a consistent rhythm and uniformity in built form.
5. The appeal proposal would result in a bay window to the front elevation of the property. Such features are not characteristic of this part of the terrace, in which windows are generally flush fitting. Although the proposed bay window would be relatively modest in its projection and height, it would be at odds with the

remainder of this part of the terrace. It would disrupt the consistent rhythm and uniformity of the existing built form and, therefore, appear incongruous.

6. The appellant argues that the proposed bay window would contribute to the visual interest of the wider street, given its architectural variety. I acknowledge that there is a variety of architectural styles within the wider Maynard Road including properties which feature bay windows. This includes at Nos. 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47 and 49. Nonetheless, I observed on site that these properties are not part of the same terrace as the appeal property and are of a clearly different architectural style, with the bay windows generally forming historic features of the properties. They are, therefore, not directly comparable to the appeal property. As such, the existence of those other bay windows does not lead me to an alternative conclusion on this main issue.
7. The Council does not object to the proposed rear extension in character and appearance terms. From the evidence before me and my observations on site, I have no reason to disagree. The extension would assimilate to an acceptable standard with the surrounding area.
8. Taking account of the above, I conclude that the proposed development, namely the front bay window, would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal does not accord with the relevant provisions of Policy 53 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1. This policy, in summary, seeks that development reinforces and enhances local character and distinctiveness and responds appropriately to its context.

Living conditions

9. At the rear of the appeal property there is an existing single storey extension which is set back from the boundary with No 31. The appeal proposal includes an enlarged single storey extension which would extend to the shared boundary with No 31 as well as extending deeper into the garden. The proposed extension would be similar in design and scale to that of extensions to several properties in the terrace of which the appeal property forms part and the wider surrounding area.
10. The Council raises concerns that the proposed extension would adversely impact the occupiers of No 31, creating an increased sense of enclosure and reducing the daylight and sunlight received by the property. However, the design of the proposed extension, in particular the low eaves level and pitched roof proposed along the shared boundary, would minimise the bulk of the extension when viewed from No 31. In this regard, the proposed extension would not result in a significant change to the outlook from No 31 compared to the existing conditions. Outlook would generally remain down through the rear garden of that property. In addition, due to the low eaves height and pitched roof, the impact of the proposed extension on the levels of daylight and sunlight reaching No 31 is likely to be minimal, taking into account the orientation of the properties and established surrounding built form, including at No 29.
11. For the reasons set out above, the proposed rear extension would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 31 Maynard Road, with particular regard to daylight, sunlight and outlook. In this regard, the appeal proposal would comply with the relevant provisions of Policy 57 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1. Amongst other matters, this policy seeks that

development avoids harmful impacts from overlooking, enclosure and/or the loss of privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Conclusion

12. While I am satisfied that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 31, it would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
13. Therefore, for the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Everitt

INSPECTOR