

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2016

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/16/3153573

54 Sutton Court Road, Plaistow, London, E13 9NW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Rahman against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 16/00893/HH dated 24 March 2016 was refused by notice dated 20 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as a second storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated on a residential street that comprises of two storey-terraced houses. The properties have a similar design and regular features including bay windows. These features, alongside street trees gives the area a pleasant and uniform character.
 4. The proposal seeks a rear first floor extension above an existing ground floor structure. Whilst I was able to see a number of different ground floor additions on neighbouring properties, the two storey rear projections along the terrace mainly appeared as symmetrical pairs, with roof forms that reflected the design of the main roofs. The proposal would consist of a flat roof form at first floor level that would fail to reflect that of the main roof. This, together with the absence of an adjoining two storey extension, would disrupt the uniform pattern of the terrace.
 5. I recognise that the proposal would utilise high quality materials, which would be similar to the original house. However, the proposal would still, by virtue of its scale and form, have an incongruous appearance that would be out of character with the area.
-

6. I have had regard to the examples cited by the appellant of other first floor extensions. However, I have not been provided with the planning history of these sites and I am not aware of their full circumstances. In any event, each case must be assessed on its own merits.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Of the policies quoted in the refusal notice, I consider Policies SP1, SP3 and H1 of the Council's Core Strategy, Policy H17 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan and Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan to be of most relevance. The proposal would conflict with these Policies, with Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and the Supplementary Planning Guidance No 15 *Altering and Extending Your Home*, which seek, amongst other matters, development that are of a high quality design and are appropriate in terms of the relationship to the character of the surrounding area. Given the harm that I have identified in respect of the main issue, I do not consider the proposed development would be the form of sustainable development that the Framework intends there to be a presumption in favour of.

Other Matters

8. I do not consider the development would unacceptably affect the living conditions of neighbouring residents by way of outlook due to the separation between the proposed extension and the windows on adjoining properties. This is however a neutral consideration and not a benefit of the proposal.
9. Reference has been made to a first floor rear extension with a pitched roof. I am however required to determine the appeal before me on its own merits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including the appeal site not being within a Conservation Area or a listed building, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR