

## SUMMARY OF APPEAL DECISION RECEIVED SINCE BEGINNING OF JUNE 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:	2005/0951
Location:	12 The Drive, Chingford E4
Development:	Erection of a first floor extension over existing garage at rear of property for use as a day nursery.
LBWF decision:	Refused
Appeal type:	Written Representations
Appeal decision:	Dismissed
Commentary:	The Inspector supported the Council's reasons for refusal on all the principle issues. The scale of the development was out of character and harmful to the appearance of the area, the building would harm amenities of surrounding occupiers visually and through noise and disturbance from the use, and vehicle activity would be harmful to pedestrian and highway safety.
Case officer:	Alison Bernhart   Phone: (020) 8496 6175
Ref no:	2005/1220
Location:	73 Carisbrook Road, Walthamstow E17
Development:	Erection of a single storey side and rear extension and the formation of a room in the roof involving installation of a rear dormer window.
LBWF decision:	Refused
Appeal type:	Written Representations
Appeal decision:	Dismissed.

Commentary:	<p>The application was refused on the grounds that the side element of the extension, infilling the “tunnel-back” area on the boundary to a depth of 8.2 metres from the rear main wall, was unacceptable.</p> <p>The Inspector agreed with this view, considering the extension to be harmful to the adjoining property.</p>	
Case officer:	Alison Bernhart	Phone: (020) 8496 6175

Ref no:	2005/0299 & 2004/0055/ENF	
Location:	14 Short Road, Leytonstone E11	
Development:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unauthorised conversion into 2 self-contained flats (2004/0055/ENF).</li> <li>2. Conversion into 2 self-contained flats and construction of first floor extension (2005/0299).</li> </ol>	
LBWF decision:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To serve and enforcement notice.</li> <li>2. Refusal.</li> </ol>	
Appeal type:	Written Representations	
Appeal decision:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enforcement notice quashed.</li> <li>2. Appeal allowed in relation to the conversion into 2 self-contained flats and dismissed in respect of the first floor rear extension.</li> </ol>	
Commentary:	<p>Planning permission was refused in 2004 for the retention of 2 flats at 14 Short Road E11 (2004/1538). The refusal was due to unsatisfactory stacking and inadequate room sizes. An enforcement notice was served requiring the layout of the flats to be altered. The Planning Inspector took the view that the flats are capable of providing satisfactory accommodation and he quashed the enforcement notice.</p> <p>With regard to the planning application, the Inspector allowed the retention of the 2 flats subject to the provision of suitable sound insulation. However he considered that the proposed first floor rear extension would be a bulky and un-balanced structure that would detract from local visual amenity.</p>	
Case officer:	Fred Doody	Phone: (020) 8496 6300

Ref no:	2005/1915	
---------	-----------	--

Location:	61 Old Church Road, Chingford E4	
Development:	Installation of one static internal illuminated sign and one non-illuminated sign to flank wall.	
LBWF decision:	Refused	
Appeal type:	Written Representations	
Appeal decision:	Dismissed	
Commentary:	The Inspector dismissed the appeal on the grounds that the development would have significant visual impacts on the appeal site and the townscape in general. The Inspector felt that the two panels would overburden the flank wall of the domestic size building out of scale with the property and the two panels together would lead to advertisement clutter.	
Case officer:	Caron Sanders	Phone: (020) 8496 6151

Ref no:	2005/0727	
Location:	33 Southwest Road, Leytonstone E11	
Development:	Change of use from C3 (Residential) to C2 (accommodation for teenage pregnancy) facilitated by erection of a single storey rear extension, and two dormer windows to roof at the rear.	
LBWF decision:	Refused	
Appeal type:	Written Representations	
Appeal decision:	Dismissed	
Commentary:	<p>The Inspector dismissed the appeal on the grounds that the development was likely to result in a significantly higher level of disturbance to the adjoining properties than would be experienced from a single family dwelling.</p> <p>The Inspector felt that the close proximity of public transport would mean that on-street parking caused by the use was unlikely to be a problem.</p>	
Case officer:	Michael Chalk	Phone: (020) 8496 6138

Ref no:	2005/0015/ENF	
---------	---------------	--

Location:	Unit 6 Chingford Industrial Centre, Hall Lane, E4	
Development:	Unauthorised erection of fencing on the forecourt surrounding the area used for housing skip and lighting building materials.	
LBWF decision:	Enforcement	
Appeal type:	Written Representations	
Appeal decision:	Dismissed	
Commentary:	<p>The proprietors of these commercial premises had erected a high fence around a compound used for the storage of a skip and building materials and, as the fence was considered unsightly and detrimental to neighbouring residential properties, an Enforcement Notice was served against it. The Notice also required the removal of the skip and stored materials, but as the Notice was directed against the fence only, the Inspector considered that incorrect and amended the Notice in that respect. He also considered that in principle the fence was acceptable as it screened the skip and building materials, but unduly high along the boundary with the adjoining residential properties. He therefore amended the Notice just to require the reduction in the height of the fence to 2 metres, the maximum height a fence could be built without requiring planning permission, along this boundary.</p>	
Case officer:	John Harrison	Phone: (020) 8496 6175

---