
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2016

by Andrew McCormack BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/16/3151758

24 Sprowston Road, Forest Gate, London E7 9AD

- 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 Joe Krupa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 16/00412/FUL, dated 14 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 24 Sprowston Road, Forest Gate, London E7 9AD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 16/00412/FUL, dated 14 February 2016 and subject to the conditions set out in the schedule attached to this decision.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of the site visit construction was underway at the appeal property relating to the approved ground floor rear extension. As a result, I was able to assess the proposed development in the context of that partly built extension and have, in part, considered this appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the original property.

Reasons

4. The appeal proposal relates to a large detached Victorian property situated on the east side of Sprowston Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and is characterised by a mix of terrace, semi-detached and detached properties. The front of the host property is balanced and provides a symmetry in its appearance and scale with the double fronted bays on the ground floor and windows to the first floor.
 5. The original property has had a number of rear extensions added including an initial ground floor extension and a first floor return extension to approximately half the width of the property. More recently, a further ground floor rear extension has been approved and was under construction at the time of the site visit. As a result, the original rear elevation of the property has been largely lost from view. Whilst constructed of similar materials which provide a
-

degree of visual consistency, the rear elevation of the host property with its various extensions is an eclectic and awkward combination of mono-pitched and flat-roofed extensions.

6. The original host property is a large and bulky building. However, its scale and mass are in keeping with its neighbouring properties and such attributes are characteristic of properties in that part of Sprowston Road. Despite the balanced appearance of the front elevation of the host property, the existing extensions to the rear do not provide such a balanced or cohesive appearance. However, the extensions which are built or under construction are of a scale and form which is in keeping with the original property and are subservient to its form and scale.
7. Whilst the proposed extension would be a further addition to the original property, it would be subservient to it. Its scale and form would be consistent with the other rear extensions. The proposed mono-pitched roof and extent of the proposal would complement the existing first floor extension and would 'round off' the extended property at first floor level. Furthermore, in combination with the other extensions it would provide a much more balanced and coherent appearance to the rear elevation.
8. The proposed extension would create additional residential accommodation at the property which is located in an established and accessible residential area. The scale, form and character of the proposed extension would not be overbearing to the property, nor would it create a massing that would be out of keeping with the surrounding properties or area. Furthermore, having had regard to the large rear garden of the property and having assessed the cumulative effect of the various extensions, I find that the proposal would not be visually incongruous or result in an overdevelopment of the site.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the original property. It would comply with Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies S6, SP1 and SP2 of the Newham Core Strategy, Policy SP8 of the Proposed Submission Draft Detailed Sites and Policies Development Plan Document, Policy H17 of the Unitary Development Plan and the guidance within the 'Altering and Extending Your Home' Supplementary Planning Guidance. Amongst other matters, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that development, including alterations and extensions, does not adversely affect the character and appearance of buildings and the surrounding area.

Conditions

10. I have had regard to the planning conditions that have been suggested by the appellant. Where necessary, and in the interests of conciseness and enforceability, I have altered the suggested conditions to better reflect the relevant parts of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
11. In addition to the standard implementation condition (1), I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans (2) in the interests of providing certainty. A condition relating to the development permitted being constructed in materials which match the existing building (3) is necessary and reasonable for reasons of character and appearance. Finally, I have imposed a condition removing permitted development rights with regard to windows (4). The PPG indicates that such restrictions should be exceptional. In this case, I consider

there to be sufficient justification for such restrictions in order to protect character and appearance and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard for all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew McCormack

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No: C12948-800 – ‘Block Plan / Location Plan’; Drawing No: C12948-801 – ‘Existing / Approved Floor Layout’; Drawing C12948-803 – ‘Approved Elevations’; and Drawing No: C12948-804 – ‘Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations’, all dated February 2016.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no windows, dormer windows or other openings other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be inserted into the development hereby permitted without planning permission first having been granted by the local planning authority.

END OF SCHEDULE