
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 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: 01 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/16/3158105

31 Durham Road, Manor Park, London E12 5AY

- 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 Butt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 16/01304/HH, dated 25 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is for a loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. Policy SP8 of the Proposed Submission Draft Detailed Sites and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) was referenced in the decision notice. Since then, the Council has adopted the DPD and at SP8 the DPD repeats almost exactly the wording of the submission draft version. I have considered this appeal on the basis of the adopted policy.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and designated Durham Road Conservation Area

Reasons

4. The Durham Road Conservation Area (CA) comprises a leafy residential suburb characterised by a coherent series of straight lined urban streets with repetitive two storey single fronted houses with fine detailing to doors and windows and set in consistently sized plots. The houses and street pattern contributes to achieving a high quality Victorian townscape, which has largely retained its original design features including its roofscapes. This little changed appearance contributes to the significance of the CA, which is largely derived from the coherence of its built form.
 5. The proposal would see the construction of a dormer to the rear roofslope measuring some 1.3m in height, 2.3m in depth and 4.2m in width and would incorporate a flat roof. The appellant reasons that the proposal is consistent with similar dormers elsewhere in the conservation area and produces photographs to illustrate his point. I am though conscious of the Council's
-

stance in the supporting text to Policy SP3 of Newham's Core Strategy which states that design should resolve rather than repeat past mistakes. Nor are the full backgrounds to these cases available to me. Advice on the preferred arrangements for dormer additions is contained within the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Altering and Extending Your Home' (SPG). This aspect of the proposal would contradict the advice contained in this guidance to a significant degree.

6. From the information before me and following my site visit, the proposed dormer would not relate well to the host property. Despite the relatively well screened location to the rear and at mid terrace, the proposed rear dormer would be partially visible from Albany Road close to the junction with Durham Road. From this vantage point, the terrace remains uncluttered by modern additions or alterations, which is a pleasing part of the character of the CA generally. The dormer would result in a significant degradation of the unaltered roofscape of this terrace and in turn would cause a degree of harm to the significance of the CA that I have outlined above.
7. Having arrived at the conclusions above, it follows that the proposed dormer would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The proposal would therefore be in conflict with Policy H17 of the Newham Unitary Development Plan, Policies SP1, SP3 and SP5 of the CS and policies 3.4, 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of The London Plan which seek, amongst other things, to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas through good urban design and local distinctiveness. These objectives are consistent with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. I have found that the proposed dormer would cause a degree of harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset although such harm would be less than substantial. The appellant has not raised any public benefits or other considerations that would justify overriding the harm that I have identified.

Conclusions

9. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR