
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2017

by Elaine Gray MA(Hons) MSc IHBC

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

Decision date: 22 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/17/3169814

182 Masterman Road, East Ham E6 3NN

- 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 U S Akif against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 16/03645/FUL, dated 21 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with particular regard to outlook and visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located on the corner adjacent to the junction between Masterman Road and Buxton Road. The development would comprise an extension to the rear of the building, and the infilling of the existing rear yard.
 4. No 182 is an end-of-terrace building whose rear elevation is clearly visible from the street. The main building is two storeys in height, with a pitched roof and a gable end facing Buxton Road. To the rear is a lower two storey outshot which is set in from the face of the gable elevation, and set down below the roof height of the main building. The rear outshot is paired with a similar structure next door at 184 Masterman Road.
 5. I accept that the extension would sit within the footprint of the appeal site, and would reflect the existing roof heights. In terms of design, it would broadly reflect elements of the existing building and those in the vicinity.
 6. At present, the area between the side elevation of the outshot and the boundary wall to the east is occupied by a single storey mono-pitched structure. The proposed first floor extension would infill the space above the mono-pitched structure. It would rise to meet the eaves height of the existing building, and would have a flat roof. The flat roof would be out of keeping with
-

the characteristic pitched roofs of the appeal site, and particularly at this elevated height, would appear at odds with its surroundings.

7. The extension would also step out to finish on the line of the boundary wall and would almost double the depth of the property at eaves level. This would establish a dominant and imposing addition located immediately adjacent to the footpath, and would be a marked departure from the existing layout whereby the rear extensions are visually subservient to the main building.
8. The single storey extension to the rear would also add significant bulk to the building, although its visual impact within the public realm would be limited as it would largely be concealed by the boundary wall.
9. Nonetheless, I find that the proposed first floor rear extension would represent a bulky and incongruous element. It would appear as a substantial, disproportionately large addition to the building, when viewed from the surroundings, and would thus fail to respect the local design characteristics. The character and appearance of the surrounding area would thereby be unacceptably harmed by the development.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to comply with Policy SP1 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan: Core Strategy (CS, January 2012), insofar as it promotes high quality development which respects, takes advantage of, and enhances the positive elements and distinctive features of the borough, and CS Policy SP3, which amongst other things, requires an analysis of local character and the specific attributes of the site, seeking to reinforce or create positive local distinctiveness, whilst securing integration and coherence with the local context.
11. I accept that the proposal would provide much needed storage for the ground floor retail unit, and that the design would also extend the functionality of the site. However, it may be that these benefits could be achieved by a scheme that would be visually more sympathetic than that proposed. Moreover, these would be private benefits that would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Living conditions

12. In terms of living conditions, the Council is concerned that the development would be harmful to the outlook from the neighbouring property at 184 Masterman Road.
13. The wall forming the boundary between the appeal site and No 184 would be raised from a height of approximately 2.8m to approximately 3.05m. Whilst this would be visible, the additional height would be too small to have a materially detrimental increase on the outlook from or sense of enclosure within the garden. The outlook for those occupants using the garden towards the north and west would remain as existing.
14. On the first floor, the extension would project beyond the line of the existing rear elevation by approximately 1.5m. The proposed first floor plan shows that the corner of the extension would not intrude upon a 45 degree angle taken from the centre of the adjoining first floor window. I note that this property is residential, but it is unclear from the evidence whether or not this window serves a habitable room. In any case, I consider that, by preserving a line of sight to a 45 degree angle, the projection of the extension would not be

harmfully overbearing, and the outlook from this window would not be unacceptably compromised.

15. Drawing these factors together, I conclude that the living conditions of the occupants of No 184 would not be unacceptably harmed. The development would thus comply with Policy SP8 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan: Detailed Sites and Policies Development Plan Document (October 2016), which seeks to ensure neighbourly development.

Conclusion

16. Despite my finding that the development would not harm the living conditions of neighbours, it would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Taking all other matters into consideration, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Gray

INSPECTOR