

## SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISION RECEIVED SINCE BEGINNING OF AUGUST 2006

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 Chris Collison on (020) 8496 6190

### APPEAL UPDATE REPORT

Ref no:	2005/0802
Location:	124-130 Chingford Mount Road, Chingford E4
Development:	Demolition of existing units and erection of 12 self-contained flats comprising 6 x 2 bed and 2 x 1 bed units. Provision of 4 parking spaces.
LBWF decision:	Refused
Appeal type:	Written representations
Appeal decision:	Allowed
Commentary:	<p>In allowing the appeal the Inspector took the view that the proposal met both local and national policies which support minimising the amount of on-site parking in locations that are well served by public transport. Therefore, the proposal accorded with the objectives of policy BHE4 and Appendix 1 of the Waltham Forest Unitary Development Plan 2006.</p> <p>The Inspector supported residential use of the site and whilst acknowledging that construction works are likely to cause noise and disturbance, was of the view that the siting, height, design and orientation of the proposed scheme would ensure that living conditions of neighbours are not unduly affected. He approved the scheme subject to conditions.</p>
Case officer:	Cecilia Kadiri   Phone: (020) 8496 6138

Ref no:	2005/1143
Location:	81 Grove Green Road, Leytonstone E11
Development:	1) Conversion of residential property into 3 x 1 bedroom flats and 2 studio flats. 2) Formation of a room in the roof involving the installation of a rear dormer window. 3) Provision of one parking space and bin stores. 4)

	Alterations to front and side elevations.
LBWF decision:	Refused
Appeal type:	Written Representations
Appeal decision:	Dismissed
Commentary:	<p>The Inspector concluded the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The movement of the door of the side elevation and replacement of the front door with a window would adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</li><li>• The dormer window would not be contained within the roofspace which would be incongruous with the general pattern of roof form in the area.</li><li>• The proposal would harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents by way of increased noise and disturbance due to the increase to 5 units.</li><li>• The amenity of future residents would be adversely affected by way of a cramped standard of accommodation.</li><li>• The amenity space would be too small for effective and private use by each of the residents contrary to SPG2.</li><li>• The proposed parking space would adversely affect highway safety.</li></ul> <p>For the reasons above, the Inspector concludes that the proposal would be contrary to policies in the adopted Unitary Development Plan 2006 and supplementary Planning Guidance Notes 2 and 4.</p> <p>The appeal was dismissed.</p>
Case officer:	Rachel Miller   Phone: (020) 8496 6068