
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2026

by **B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U5930/D/25/3372982

29 Sunset Avenue, Chingford, Waltham Forest E4 7LW

- 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 Hasan Polat against the decision of Waltham Forest London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 251632.
 - The development proposed is Construction of single storey side infill and rear extension with part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 16 December 2025, the Government published a consultation on proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Whilst broad changes to the structure of the Framework are proposed as part of this consultation, these proposals could be subject to further change and can only be given very limited weight at this stage. It has therefore not been necessary to consult the parties on the changes, and in reaching my decision, I have had regard to the Framework published in December 2024.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The impact of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 27 Sunset Avenue, with particular reference to outlook and light; and
 - The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. To the rear, the appeal property has a two storey projection with a flat roof, as does the neighbouring property, 27 Sunset Avenue (No 27). Regardless of whether these projections are part of the original property, the proposed ground floor extension would project 3.5 metres beyond No 27's rear elevation.
5. Sunset Avenue is on a very steep incline. As a result, the appeal property is positioned noticeably higher than No 27, whilst it is noticeably lower than its other

neighbouring property, 31 Sunset Avenue. As the extension would be built right to the shared boundary with No 27 its depth has the potential to impact both the outlook and level of light for occupiers of the neighbouring property. Furthermore, due to the significant difference in ground levels between the properties, I am concerned that the proposed extension would appear substantially higher when viewed from the neighbouring property.

6. No 27 has windows on its rear elevation which appear to supply a kitchen. Given that the windows are only a short distance from the shared boundary, the extension would be highly visible from within the room. The extension would have a uniform height and extend 3.5 metres in depth with no softening features. Due to the significant levels difference between the properties it would have a looming presence. The combined depth, height and proximity of the proposed rear extension to the neighbouring property's habitable windows mean that it would have an adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in terms of a sense of enclosure and thus a loss of outlook.
7. Equally, the presence of an extension of this depth, height and with limited separation from No 27's ground floor windows would cause overshadowing throughout the year, and potentially for longer periods during the winter months. Overall, I find that the extension, in such close proximity, would harmfully reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight reaching the neighbouring property's nearest windows, particularly given the appeal proposal's position to the south of No 27.
8. The main parties are in agreement that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 31 Sunset Avenue. Nevertheless, given my findings in relation to the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 27, the proposal would conflict with Policy 57 of the Waltham Forest Local Plan Part 1 (2024) (Local Plan). The policy requires that proposals avoid harmful impacts through the loss of outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Character and appearance

9. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area. Its facing materials include brickwork, white render and a hipped, tiled roof, and its front elevation displays features characteristic of its period such as a first floor bay window, prominent front gable and decorative timber details at first floor level. To the rear, it has a two storey projection with a flat roof, which matches with the projection at No 27. As a result, the pair of semi-detached houses are largely identical when viewed from both the front and rear of the properties.
10. Sunset Avenue features a mixture of semi-detached houses and bungalows. A number of properties within the immediate area have been extended and altered in various ways, including with rear and side projections and flat roof dormer windows within both front and rear roof slopes.
11. I have been referred to the Waltham Forest Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2010) in relation to the proposal's subservience to the host property. The appeal property's existing two storey rear projection has a flat roof. As the proposal would directly adjoin this, I do not find that the proposed flat roof would be an incongruous addition to the property, and its roof form would reduce the bulk of the extension. Consequently, the extension's roof would be set significantly below the highest point of the host dwelling's

principal roof form and it would not extend further to the rear than the existing first floor projection. In this way it would maintain a level of subservience to the host property.

12. The resulting full width two storey rear projection would alter the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses, as any extension would. The first floor rear extension would be contained within the existing dwelling's L-shaped form, and as a result would be imperceptible in many viewpoints from the front of the appeal site. Although there are few comparable full-width two-storey rear extensions in the area, the proposal's subordinate massing would ensure that it would sit comfortably with the dwelling's existing form. Overall, it would be perceived as a discreet addition that would neither dominate the house nor appear out of keeping with the wider street scene.
13. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy 53 of the Local Plan which, amongst other aspects, seeks to reinforce and/or enhance local character and distinctiveness, taking into account existing patterns of development.

Other Matters

14. I have been referred to an appeal decision in relation to a proposal at 17 Normanton Park, Chingford (PINS Ref: APP/U5930/D/24/3343475). Insofar as the proposal relates to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, from the evidence before me, in that instance there was not a significant levels difference between the appeal site and the neighbouring property. Therefore, I am not satisfied the case is directly comparable to the proposal before me.
15. My attention has been drawn to the rear extension at 40 Sunset Avenue. I have not been provided with information as to whether the circumstances in that case were the same as the case before me. Notwithstanding this, each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

16. The proposal would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR