



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2025

by **Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/25/3372978

58 Corbett Road, Walthamstow, London E17 3JZ

- 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 Shakeal Akram against the decision of the London Borough of Waltham Forest Council.
 - The application Ref. is 251074.
 - The development proposed is for a 2.5m rear ground floor sun room/conservatory extension with 2.6m max height from natural ground floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2.5m rear ground floor sun room/conservatory extension with 2.6m max height from natural ground floor level at 58 Corbett Road, Walthamstow, London E17 3JZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 251074 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, 2569-PL01 and 2569-PL02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and upon the living conditions of the occupants of 56 Corbett Road, with specific reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site comprises an end-terrace house with a number of extensions on the ground, first floor and at roof level. The proposal is for a modest sunroom/conservatory to be built off of an existing kitchen extension into the rear garden area, within which an outbuilding is located.
4. I noted on my site visit that various extensions to other neighbouring properties had been constructed with 56 Corbett Road having a conservatory set away from the rear boundary, itself demarcated by a close-boarded fence and trellis above. There are some windows on the original rear elevation of no56, although these are

shielded by an opaque, low Perspex lean-to structure and an area for clothes drying.

5. I note that the total depth of extensions at ground floor level to the host dwelling would amount to approximately 5.2m, however, the subject extension would be low in stature with a lean-to roof sloping down towards its rear. The extension would reduce the amount of private rear amenity space and whilst Policy 56 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1 (Shaping the Borough 2020 – 2035) adopted 2024 (LP) stipulates a minimum of 50sqm of private external amenity space per dwelling for houses, the remaining area would be appropriately located and usable, would be easily accessible with reasonable levels of sunlight penetration. Ultimately, I consider that the proposed extension would be subordinate in form to the host dwelling with it comprising a space that can be used as a transition from internal to external living environments of the appeal property.
6. Overall I consider that the proposal would make efficient use of urban land and would comply with Policy 53 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1 (Shaping the Borough 2020 – 2035) adopted 2024 (LP) which requires proposals to deliver high quality design whilst achieving appropriate intensification and reinforcing local character and distinctiveness, taking into account existing patterns of development whilst responding appropriately to their context in terms of scale, height and massing.

Living Conditions

7. As cited within the Council's Officer Report, the proposal would extend approximately 2.6m beyond the lean-to structure on the rear of no56. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would lengthen built form along the shared boundary, however, by virtue of its limited height, I consider that it would not give rise to an undue loss of outlook particularly bearing in mind the existence of the aforementioned Perspex lean-to roof and the washing lines that are in situ.
8. Furthermore, I consider that the extension would not be visually oppressive from the neighbouring garden amenity area with it only being marginally higher than the boundary fence itself. Consequently, I consider that it would not cause significant harm to the neighbouring amenities at no 56 and I find no conflict between the scheme and LP Policy 57 which states that new development should respect the amenity of existing and future occupiers, neighbours and the surrounding area by, amongst other things, avoiding harmful impacts from enclosure.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
10. In addition to the standard time limit condition the Council has suggested a condition be imposed requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and that the materials of the extension match the existing building, I consider these necessary in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR