



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: 12th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/19/3241577

258 Plashet Grove, London E6 1DQ

- 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 Irfan Kazmi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 19/02629/FUL, dated 26 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2019.
 - The proposed development is loft conversion with rear dormer, hip to gable roof profile.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, which includes the setting of Passmore Edwards Library, a grade II listed building.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached property on the southern side of Plashet Grove which adjoins No. 260 to the east. The property forms part of a row of semi-detached houses which are characterised by their hipped roofs and two-storey bay features. There is an appreciable architectural cohesion between each of the semi-detached pairs which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the streetscene. The site lies opposite the Passmore Edwards Library, a grade II listed building whose significance, in my view, is largely derived from the quality of its brickwork, fine stone detailing and clock turret. The building's significance is enhanced by its setting within the open and verdant environs of Plashet Park. The architectural uniformity of the row of semi-detached houses also enhances the significance of the setting of the listed building as, when appreciated together within the street, the materials, cohesion of the row, and the symmetry of the pairs compliments the symmetry of the listed building and the similar materials.
 5. The proposed roof form would be plainly visible from the street and would contrast poorly with the hipped roof of No. 260, resulting in a loss of architectural symmetry shared between the two properties. In the context of
-

- No. 260 and the wider row of semi-detached properties, the proposal would result in the appeal property having an overtly incongruous appearance that would undermine the cohesion that is characteristic of the row. As such, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. Furthermore, as the uniformity of the row would be visibly eroded, the proposal would also cause harm, albeit less than substantial, to the setting of the grade II listed building. The use of energy efficient or matching materials would not outweigh those harms.
6. While there may be some architectural variety along the full length of Plashet Grove, the appeal property forms part of a distinct row which has a clear architectural uniformity. The proposal would disrupt that uniformity. In particular, the appellant has drawn my attention to a roof extension at No. 270. In contrast to the appeal properties and other properties within the row, No. 270 forms part of a distinctly asymmetrical pairing that is architecturally differentiated from the rest of the row. As such, the example at No. 270 is not directly comparable to nor provides any justifiable precedent for the proposal.
 7. The proposed rear dormer extension would be acceptable, given that there are numerous examples of similar development within the surrounding area, and it would not be seen in the same context as the listed building in front of the site. However, this would not alleviate the harm that would result from the proposal when considered as a whole.
 8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, which includes the setting of the grade II listed Passmore Edwards Library. The proposal would therefore conflict 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 S6, SP1, SP3 and SP8 of the Local Plan (2018), which together state that development should respond to local character, be designed to the highest quality, provide a high quality public realm, and enhance and integrate with residential environments. The proposal would also conflict with Policy 7.8 of the London Plan, Policy HC1 of the Draft London Plan and Policy SP5 of the Local Plan, which require that development should preserve and enhance the setting of designated heritage assets. However, the proposal would not conflict with Policy D1B of the Draft London Plan or Policy H1 of the Local Plan, which relate to matters other than character, appearance or heritage and so are limited relevance.
 9. The harm to the setting of the nearby grade II listed building would be less than substantial. However, there are no public benefits that would outweigh that harm.

Other Matters

10. The appellant states that the proposal would provide additional living space to the occupants and that it can be difficult to move to a bigger house. While I sympathise, this personal benefit would be clearly outweighed by the identified harm that would be caused by the proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. 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

12. 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