The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/19/3240942
91 Wellington Road, East Ham, London E6 6EB

- 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 Fahad Mclean against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
- The application Ref 19/02169/HH, dated 1 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2019.
- The development is a double storey side extension and single storey rear extension and loft conversion.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. During my site visit, I observed that the development had already been implemented. I have provided my recommendation on the basis that this appeal relates to a retrospective application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey, end-of-terrace property on the eastern side of Wellington Road. The appeal property is situated at the northern end of a terrace of properties numbered 91-109. While No. 109 at the southern end doesn't correspond to the characteristics of the rest of the terrace, Nos. 93-107 have a coherent and uniform appearance, particularly at roof-level where there is a consistent roof ridge and profile as well as chimney stacks and parapet walls set at regular intervals.

6. The property has been subject to a roof extension, which has resulted in the loss of the chimney stack and parapet wall. The roof extension extends across the full width of the rear roofslope with no material setback from the sides or eaves and is clearly visible from positions in the street to the north. A new

brick gable wall has been constructed at the northern side of the appeal property, which extends up to the full height of the roof extension. The roof extension, due to its combined height and depth and the lack of any significant setback, appears as an excessive and insubordinate addition to the host property. Furthermore, the appearance of the solid brick wall at roof-level contrasts poorly with the materiality of the remainder of the appeal property's roof. Due to its prominent appearance within the street, the roof extension serves to undermine the consistency of the roofline of the host terrace. The loss of the chimney stack and parapet roof also causes harm to the cohesion of the terrace at roof-level.

7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The development therefore conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Policies D1, D2 and D7 of the Draft London Plan (2019), Policies SP1, SP3 and S6 of the Local Plan (2018), and the Altering and Extending your Home SPD (2018) which together aim to ensure that development should respond to local character, be designed to the highest quality, provide a high quality public realm, and enhance residential environments.

Other Matters

8. The appellant states that the design of the development is commonplace in the borough and in other boroughs. However, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this is the case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR