
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2017

by Janet Wilson BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI DMS

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

Decision date: 25th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/17/3169010

267 Barking Road, Plaistow, LONDON E13 8EQ

- 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 Lamber Bhuller against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 16/00624/FUL, dated 1 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is change of use from bookmakers at ground floor to 1 x 2 bed flat (retrospective) and creation of 2 x 1 bed units above including external alterations to the front and rear elevations and the introduction of a mansard roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has granted planning permission¹ for aspects of this development under a subsequent application including retrospective change of use of the ground floor and internal alterations. Whilst some of the internal alterations vary to the appeal scheme, the Council find the loss of the bookmakers and the change of use to residential acceptable. The main issue therefore is the effect of the remaining part, the Mansard roof, on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appearance of the buildings along Barking Road is generally variable. Nevertheless, the appeal building is part of a terrace where the form, massing and overall appearance remains essentially unaltered, despite some limited fenestration changes and the building next door being taller. The predominant roof characteristics are parapets concealing butterfly roofs. Seen in this context, the addition of raised party walls and the mansard roof would introduce a bulky, dominant and incongruous addition to the building which would disrupt the uniform rhythm and appearance of the terrace, particularly when seen from the opposite side of the street and the rear of the appeal site.
4. The planning permission granted by the Council for a mansard roof at 344 Barking Road and the associated officer report is noted. However, the terrace which No 344 is part of already has some mansard roofs which is not the case

¹ Newham Council 16/01382/FUL

here and it seems that there was an earlier planning permission for a mansard roof. These differences with the current proposal mean that the scheme at No 344 has very limited relevance. The officer's comments about the variable roofline along Barking Road do not sit with my own findings based on the circumstances of the appeal site and its surroundings.

5. In view of the above, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area thus bringing it into conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan – The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations since 2011 (2016) and Policies SP1, SP3 and H1 of Newham 2027 Newham's Local Plan - The Core Strategy (2012). These policies, amongst other things, seek to incorporate high quality design appropriate to context, secure high architectural quality and create positive local distinctiveness as well as developments which fit in with the character and scale of their location.
6. Other policies quoted by the Council in their decision² relate to strategic matters including lifetime homes, access to homes and improving the quality and identity of places. In the context of this appeal these Policies do not seem to be particularly relevant.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal should be dismissed.

Janet Wilson

INSPECTOR

² Policy 7.1 of the London Plan and Policies S1, S6 and SP2 of the Core Strategy