

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2017

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/17/3180982
25 Paul Street, Stratford, London E15 4QB

- 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 R Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 17/01151/HH, dated 3 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terrace dwelling in a short terraced block of about eight dwellings. It is one of a number of similar terraced blocks that typify the prevailing scale, form and pattern of development on Paul Street and the surrounding streets.
4. The terrace within which the appeal property lies is of simple appearance. At both front and rear the main body of the terrace is unbroken by protrusions, save for the small porches or canopies above the front doors that enliven the otherwise plain façade. Alleyway entrances punctuate the terrace, providing access to rear gardens and single storey outbuildings that are paired across the boundaries of alternating pairs of properties.
5. The extension may not be visible from the street frontage, but the rear of the terrace and the proposed extension would be widely visible from a significant number of nearby properties. The proposed extension would disrupt the uniformity and simplicity that typifies this terraced block, and also those around it. The Council do not object to the ground floor element of the proposal. However, whilst the ground floor element of the extension would be a relatively unobtrusive, discrete addition to the rear of the property and terrace, the first floor element above it would be anything but.
6. This part of the extension would sit awkwardly on top of the ground floor element, somewhat marooned in the centre of the rear of the rear of No. 25, inset from the rear and both side elevations of the ground floor extension. It would, as a consequence, be an incongruous, disruptive and obtrusive addition

to the rear of the appeal property that would relate poorly to both the ground floor element of the extension and also to the main dwelling.

7. Thus, I consider that the proposed extension would fail to respond positively to, or complement, the existing simple local architectural character of the host property and surrounding area, thereby causing harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal would not therefore achieve the high quality design that, collectively, policies S1, S2, SP1, SP2, SP3 and H1 of the Newham Core Strategy, policy SP8 of the Newham Local Plan: Detailed Sites and Policies Development Plan Document and policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan seek to achieve. It would also fail to secure the high quality design that the National Planning Policy Framework seeks to achieve as one of its core planning principles.
8. I accept that it would be possible to ensure that the materials used in the construction of the external faces of the extension would achieve a satisfactory match with those of the existing dwelling. However, that alone would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
9. My attention has also been drawn to an extension at the rear of a nearby property which the appellant has cited as an example of a similar extension. I do not however have the details of that proposal before me and so cannot be certain that it is directly comparable to this appeal proposal. Nonetheless, I was able to identify the property in question at the time of my visit and from what I saw I am satisfied that, if nothing else, the form of its ground and first floor extension, its relationship to the main house and the dwelling's position within the terrace differ sufficiently from that of the current proposal. I therefore give this factor limited weight.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR