

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2017

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/17/3168144

117 Wakefield Street, East Ham, London E6 1LG

- 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 D Smirnovs against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 16/03082/HH was refused by notice dated 25 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with dormer in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/03082/HH, dated 29 September 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 plan: A515-1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dormer sides and windows of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the roof and windows of the existing building.

Preliminary matter

2. The Council alleges that 117 and 119 Wakefield Street have recently been sub-divided into flats. The appellant advises, however, that they were purpose built as flats. I leave this matter to be resolved elsewhere and have considered the appeal on the basis of the current situation.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the local area.

Reasons

4. Wakefield Street is an urban residential street of mainly terraced 2 storey houses, with some evidently of Victorian or Edwardian origin interspersed with more modern buildings. No 117 takes up part of the ground floor and all of the first floor of the last section of a modern terrace. The proposal is to convert
-

- the loft, including the addition of a box dormer construction at the back and 3 rooflights at the front.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) *Altering and Extending Your Home* advises that dormers should have a substantial proportion of the existing roof around them and should not give the impression of being of full width or full height - they should not be bulky and out of proportion with the house.
 6. In this case the flat is fairly narrow, so the proposed dormer would not be particularly large even though it would take up almost all of the flat's rear roof slope. It would take up only a small proportion of the combined rear roofs of the terrace, which is not of such architectural character that it demands clean, unbroken roof lines.
 7. The proposed dormer extension would be similar to other dormers nearby, and these seem to fit in reasonably well with the mixed character of the area. It would also be similar to dormers that can generally be built on houses using permitted development rights. Although these rights do not apply in this case because the property is a flat, the building is not significantly different in appearance from a terraced house so the visual impact would be much the same.
 8. The dormer structure would not easily be seen from Wakefield Street and would only be visible in glimpsed views from nearby Katherine Road. It would not be at all intrusive or incongruous in these views. The addition of a reasonably discreet dormer structure here would therefore not be harmful. The proposed rooflights, though more visible, would be minor and inconsequential features.
 9. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the building or the local area. It therefore accords with the aims of Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies S6, SP1, SP3 and H1 of the Newham's Local Plan Core Strategy (CS), the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework, to improve the quality and distinctive identity of places, in part through high quality design. The Council also refers to CS Policies S1 and SP2 and Policy SP8 of Newham's Local Plan Detailed Sites and Policies. I see no direct relevance to this issue, however.
 10. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. A condition regarding the use of matching materials is also needed in order to protect local character and appearance. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR