

SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISION RECEIVED SINCE BEGINNING OF APRIL 2008

If you wish to receive a copy of any appeal decision please phone Brenda Danahar on (020) 8496 6305

If you wish to discuss any case please either phone the case officer listed below or Blaithin Butler on (020) 8496 6138

APPEAL UPDATE REPORT

Ref no:	2007/1083
Location:	82 Lansdowne Road and 2 St Barnabas Road, Walthamstow E17
Development:	Erection of two storey building comprising 45 x 2 bed flats.
LBWF decision:	Refused
Appeal type:	Written Representations
Appeal decision:	Allowed
Commentary:	<p>The application was refused on grounds of overdevelopment, excessive bulk and poor design and loss of natural light and overshadowing.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the proposal would not constitute an overdevelopment and the building would not be out of character with the wider area.</p> <p>In relation to impact upon adjoining occupiers the Inspector concluded that although there would be some impact in terms of natural light and outlook this would not be sufficient to justify refusal of planning permission. No significant overlooking would result from the proposals. The intensity of occupation would not have an adverse impact upon the amenity of adjoining occupiers.</p> <p>The proposals would make a valuable contribution to the borough's housing stock.</p>
Ref no:	2007/1403
Location:	Land adjacent 65 Pembroke Road, Walthamstow E17
Development:	Erection of two storey building to form 2 x 1 bed self-

	<p>contained flats.</p> <p>LBWF decision: Refused</p> <p>Appeal type: Written Representations</p> <p>Appeal decision: Allowed</p> <p>Commentary: Refused on grounds of overdevelopment, loss of privacy and general outlook and sub-standard form of accommodation. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would enhance the appearance of the street scene and would not be out of character. The Inspector also concluded that because the proposal was not for family housing provision of amenity open space should not be a requirement.</p> <p>In relation to impact upon adjoining occupiers the Inspector concluded that the proposal would not result in unacceptable levels of overlooking or loss of outlook.</p> <p>Conditions imposed requiring details of bicycle parking and refuse/recycling facilities, drainage, landscaping and materials.</p>
Ref no:	2007/0025/ENF
Location:	32-34 Claremont Road, Walthamstow E17
Development:	Without planning permission change of use from storage (B8 use Class) to place of worship (D1 Use Class).
LBWF decision:	Enforcement
Appeal type:	Written Representations
Appeal decision:	Withdrawn.
Commentary:	The applicant has withdrawn this appeal.
Ref no:	2007//0016/ENF
Location:	382 Grove Green Road, Leytonstone E11
Development:	Without planning permission erection of a porch.

LBWF decision:	Enforcement
Appeal type:	Written Representations
Appeal decision:	Dismissed
Commentary:	The ground (a) appeal under S.174 was dismissed so planning permission was not granted for the porch, on the basis of significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The requirements of the Enforcement Notice were upheld.
<hr/>	
Ref no:	2007/1162
Location:	382 Grove Green Road, Leytonstone E11
Development:	Retention of porch to side elevation of residential property.
LBWF decision:	Refused
Appeal type:	Written Representations
Appeal decision:	Dismissed
Commentary:	The Inspector considered the porch to be overdominant and causing significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. He therefore dismissed the S.78 appeal against the refusal of planning permission.
<hr/>	
Ref no:	2007/0900
Location:	Land rear of 12A Falmouth Avenue, Chingford E4
Development:	Erection of pair of semi-detached 1-bedroom houses.
LBWF decision:	Refused
Appeal type:	Written Representations
Appeal decision:	Dismissed

Commentary:	<p>The appeal Inspector agreed that the proposed development and design would seriously undermine the character and appearance of the area and conflict with policies BHE1, B HE2 and PSC1.</p> <p>The Inspector considered the proposed development would unacceptably affect the living conditions of nearby residents, as the building would sit uncomfortably close to the rear garden of 111 Handsworth Avenue and appear oppressive, and have a prominent visual impact on the appearance from the street.</p> <p>The Inspector was concerned that the development would have an impact on the street trees and shorten their life. As these have a significant amenity value the development would be unacceptable and conflict with the council's policies to protect them.</p>
Ref no:	2006/0044/ENF
Location:	Rear of 853-855 High Road, Leytonstone E11
Development:	Without planning permission erection of three storey building at rear.
LBWF decision:	Enforcement
Appeal type:	Written Representations
Appeal decision:	Allowed in part
Commentary:	<p>The period for compliance with the Enforcement Notice was extended from 56 days to 9 months. The remaining requirements of the Notice were upheld and the ground (a) appeal was dismissed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Inspector considered the extension causes harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings and the new dwellings in terms of outlook, natural light and overlooking. 2. The Inspector considered the access arrangements of the flats and the lack of useable amenity space also contributed to an unsatisfactory living environment for the occupiers of the new dwellings. 3. The Inspector considered the 3 storey building to be out of scale with buildings in the area and to cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings.

Ref no:	2007/0458
Location:	815 Lea Bridge Road, Walthamstow E17
Development:	Installation of car wash to rear of property.
LBWF decision:	Refused
Appeal type:	Hearing
Appeal decision:	Dismissed
Commentary:	The Planning Inspector took the view that the proposal would cause considerable harm to the living conditions of local residents. He concluded that it is an inappropriate development at this location and dismissed the appeal on the basis of conflict with UDP Policy BHE3.
