
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2016

by Gareth W Thomas BSc(Hons), MSc(Dist), PgDip, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/16/3155075

24 Patrick Road, Plaistow, London E13 9QA

- 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 Christopher Shea against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 16/01248/HH, dated 25 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first floor rear extension at 24 Patrick Road, Plaistow, London E13 9QA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01248/HH, dated 25 April 2016, subject to the following 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 carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing Plans Sheet Number 01; Existing Elevations Sheet Number 02; Proposed Plans Sheet Number 03; Proposed Elevations Sheet Number 04; Block Plan Sheet Number 05 and Location Plan Sheet Number 06.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a narrow width mid-terraced two storey property of identical properties in a tightly knit residential area. The existing single storey extension would be taken up to the first floor with the addition of a mono-pitched roof, a design solution generally supported by the Council in these types of situations as advised in the Newham Supplementary Planning Guidance: Altering and Extending your home (SPG). The existing projection of
-

3m would be maintained with the first floor addition that would provide a third bedroom for the property.

4. There are a large number of properties both here and on the adjoining street where the rear elevations have not been altered and the simple symmetry of shared ground floor gable extensions where they still exist form a pleasing part of the architectural character of the area. However, this is not universal and there are a number of other extensions of varying sizes and design at the rear of this terrace. Moreover, a large flat roofed dormer has been added to the rear of the appeal site, which has dramatically altered the character of this property when viewed from other properties on the adjoining street. There are no public vantage points from where the rear of this property can be seen.
5. I find that the proposed mono-pitched roof design would mean that the extension as proposed would remain subservient to the host property. Whilst the Council provides a comprehensive background to reasons why other properties have been extended, it seems to me that there are now a number of extensions that have been constructed over a lengthy period of time that has denuded the general character at the rear. That said, I conclude that irrespective, this proposal would result in a satisfactory appearance to the rear and would not unacceptably disrupt any perceptible rhythm of design.
6. Consequently the proposal would accord with Policies 7.1, 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of The London Plan and with Newham Core Strategy Policies S1, S6, SP1, SP2, SP3 and H1, as well as the Council's SPG. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that developments do not harm the character and appearance of the area, whilst maintaining local distinctiveness through high quality design. In this regard, the development would also satisfy the design aims embodied in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusions

7. Having regard to the above reasons and taking into account all other matters raised, this appeal is allowed.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR