The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February, 2017

by G. Rollings, BA(Hons) MA(UD) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12th June, 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/16/3159512
5 Leytonstone Road, Stratford, London, E15 1JA

- 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 A Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
- The application Ref: 16/01807/FUL dated 10 June, 2016 was refused by notice dated 2 September, 2016.
- The development proposed is to increase the existing ridge height with a loft conversion and rear dormer extension with installation of 2 velux windows at front.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council adopted its *Newham 2027 Detailed Sites and Policies Development Plan Document* (DSPDPD) in October 2016, following its refusal of the appeal proposal, but prior to lodgement of the appeal. The Council included the relevant draft policies in its reasons for refusal. All parties have had the opportunity to comment on the policies that are relevant to this appeal, which now form part of the adopted development plan for the area, and therefore carry significant weight in my decision. The Unitary Development Plan policy referred to by the Council have has superseded by the DPD and I will make no further reference to it.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:

   - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
   - Whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory living standards for future occupants, with reference to internal space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site accommodates a three-storey, mid-terrace building. It is part of a parade of retail and commercial uses at ground floor level, with the floors above combining with neighbouring buildings to provide a several bedsit rooms. The adjoining buildings at 1 and 3 Leytonstone Road have a similar

design to the appeal building, with Nos. 7 and 9 of a slightly different appearance with a parapet wall on the front elevation at roof level, and a slightly higher roof ridge than Nos. 1, 3 and 5.

5. The roof ridge would be raised to a height similar to the existing ridge on Nos. 7 and 9, and due to the parapet wall, visibility would be restricted from the side road approaches. There is a clear view of the roof ridge from the front approach along The Grove and Maryland Point. However, in both front and rear views, the matched height would not appear disruptive in views of the terrace, nor obtrusive in wider views. The proposed velux-style windows in the front elevation would be similar to those on neighbouring buildings and would also not appear out of character.

6. I noticed on my site visit that the property had a chimney stack on its shared boundary at No. 7, and brickwork parapet ridges along both of the side boundaries. These are also visible on the properties where there is already a higher ridge, but those on the appeal property to reach the same height as the ridge at No. 7. The plans do not indicate the presence of the ridges, and were the appeal to be allowed, it would be possible to impose a condition requiring the appellant to finalise these details with the Council. This would not alter the principle of the proposed development but would be necessary due to the potential for the removal of these original features, and their impact on the overall appearance of the building.

7. I now turn to the proposed rear dormer. Two previous appeal decisions for similar development in this terrace were recently dismissed. The first of these proposed rear roof dormer additions at Nos. 7 and 9, and the second proposed a dormer extension, similar to that proposed in the appeal before me. In deciding the former appeals, the Inspector noted the absence of existing dormer windows on the relatively simple rear slope.

8. There are other dormer window extensions visible in the surrounding area, but the absence of such development along the appeal terrace remains. The rear roof slope is clearly visible from surrounding properties, and from the public realm on Well Street. I acknowledge that only one property would be altered in this instance, but this would still alter the roofline and add an incongruous feature that would look out of place amongst the otherwise similar rear roof slopes.

9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, and would conflict with the Council's *Newham 2027 Core Strategy* (2012) Policies SP1 and SP3, and DSPDPD Policy SP8. Together, these policies require development to provide a high design quality that responds to local distinctiveness and its context. They are consistent with the strategic policies of *The London Plan* (2015) and the policies of the *National Planning Policy Framework*.

Living conditions

10. The Council considers that the proposed development would increase the size of an existing residential flat, to form a flat with an internal floor area of 42.5 sq.m, which it states is less than the space standard for a one-bedroom flat. However, despite the reconfiguration of the existing second floor accommodation, the proposal would enlarge an existing unit, which already provides less space than the standard. The addition of a new habitable space

within the loft – albeit a small area – would improve the existing accommodation. Accordingly, as the scheme does not include the creation of a new or additional unit of accommodation, the extension would instead be likely to result in enhanced conditions for residents.

11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would provide satisfactory living standards for future occupants, with reference to internal space, and would not conflict with DSPDPD Policy SP8's requirement to achieve relevant design standards, including those set out in the Mayor of London's *Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance* (2016).

Other matters

12. I considered whether a split decision would be appropriate, given that I have found some aspects of the design to be appropriate. However, given that raising the roof ridge height with the omission of the proposed dormer would have an impact on the amount and quality of the internal floor space, thereby potentially affecting the outcome of my considerations on the second main issue, I do not consider this appropriate.

Conclusion

13. Although I have found that the proposed development would provide appropriate living conditions for future residents, this does not outweigh its detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR