



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 07 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/17/3177570
10 Martha Road, Stratford, London E15 4NP

- 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 & Mrs Charlotte and Guy Groen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 17/00872/HH, dated 13 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a full width ground floor extension to the rear, three quarter width first floor extension to the rear and full width dormer to the rear as well as skylights to the front of the property at roof level.
-

Procedural matter

1. The Council's Decision Notice and the appellant's Appeal Form describe the proposal as "a double storey extension and a loft conversion with a rear dormer and velux windows to the front elevation". As this is a more accurate description I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey extension and a loft conversion with a rear dormer and velux windows to the front elevation, at 10 Martha Road, Stratford, London E15 4NP, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 17/00872/HH, dated 13 March 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing nos. 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 107, 108, 200, 201, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 305T, 310 and 311 (all Revision P1).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling.

Reasons

4. No. 10 is a two storey, end of terrace dwelling, located on the eastern side of Martha Road at its junction with Louise Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and is characterised by two storey terraced houses with enclosed gardens or yards to the rear. Nearby are two blocks of three storey flats.
5. There is an existing single storey rear extension at no. 10 which would be modestly increased in size to span the full width of the yard. Above this the proposed first floor rear extension would measure around 2.92m wide, 4.7m deep, and would rise to a maximum height of around 6.55m. It would stand around 1.17m from the boundary with no. 9. Also proposed are a rear dormer, to be finished in dark grey zinc cladding, 2 no. low profile roof-lights within the front roof-slope and a window within the side elevation.
6. In my judgement, the scale and form of the proposal would respect the character of the host building and the rest of the terrace such that it would politely integrate itself into the street scene. It would incorporate sufficient design articulation to prevent it appearing like a 3 storey rear extension. Rear dormer windows, incorporating a glazed door, are to be found on nearby dwellings and the design and finish of the proposed dormer would result in an addition that would sit well with the proportions and appearance of the host.
7. While the profile of the roof would be altered, I do not consider that this would be so disruptive to the rhythm of the rear of the terrace that it would harmfully change the character and appearance of the host and the area. Rather, the proposal as a modest change, the profile of which would be softened by the presence of the existing street tree, would sit well with the established development pattern of the area.
8. Accordingly, the proposal would not conflict with Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (consolidated with alterations since 2011 and published March 2016) (LP), Policies S1, S6, SP1, SP2, SP3, and H1 of the adopted London Borough of Newham Local Plan: Core Strategy (CS) and Policy SP8 of the adopted London Borough of Newham Local Plan: Detailed Sites and Policies Development Plan Document (DSDPD).
9. With regard to the effect of the proposal on the adjoining dwelling, I observed that the rear of the terrace faces east. As such the area to rear of no. 9 would be shaded by the dwellings themselves as the sun moves around. In any event, the mono-pitch design of the proposed roof and the set back of the dormer roof extension from the boundary, would make it unlikely that the proposal would harmfully overshadow the rear of no. 9.
10. Furthermore, the set-back of the glazed door and balcony area would be such that the degree of overlooking would be no greater than from the existing rear window on no. 10 and the balconies on the apartments to the rear of the terrace. Moreover, it would not be any greater than one might expect within a

densely built up urban context such as this. As for outlook, I consider that the set back of the first floor and dormer elements of the proposal from the boundary with no. 9 would mean it would not appear overbearing in the outlook from this dwelling.

11. In addition, given the small size of the proposed balcony, I consider it would be unlikely to give rise to a harmful change in the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 9 in respect of noise and disturbance. Accordingly the proposal would not harmfully change the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 9 in respect of overshadowing, overlooking, outlook and noise and disturbance, and would accord with LP Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6, CS Policies S1, S6, SP1, SP2, SP3 and H1 and DSDPD Policy SP8.
12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the tests and advice within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I agree that conditions are necessary in respect of commencement time, relating the development to the submitted plans and materials in the interests of providing certainty and protecting visual amenity.
13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Richard McCoy

Inspector