



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2020 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Joanna Gilbert MA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/20/3254069

75 Plashet Road, London E13 0QA

- 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 Kalpesh Bhudia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 19/03512/FUL, dated 16 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof extension and extension of existing dormer.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. Notwithstanding the description of development, which is taken from the application form, a more precise description of the proposal is that provided in the appeal form and decision notice as 'Hip to gable roof extension, extension of existing rear dormer and construction of a front dormer extension'. The Council considered the appeal on this basis and so shall I.
4. The Council's decision refers to Policies D1, D4 and D8 of The Draft London Plan – Intend to Publish Version. Since the application was determined by the Council, the Mayor of London issued the Publication London Plan in December 2020. Policies D1, D4 and D8 have not been altered in any substantive manner in the latest iteration of the London Plan. It has not therefore been necessary to consult the main parties on this matter.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace building with an existing additional floor within the roofspace. It is located on a prominent corner site on Plashet Road with the junction of St Antony's Road. The building has a chamfered corner to the ground and first floor elevations and the roof has a hipped design to reflect this.
7. The proposal would alter the roof from hip to gable and the chamfered corner of the first floor would be squared off. The loss of this architectural corner detailing would result in a considerable and discordant overhang to the corner of the building and would cause its upper section to dominate the ground floor. The building would therefore appear imbalanced.
8. The appeal building and 77 Plashet Road on the opposite corner are not entirely symmetrical as they have different detailing in terms of window layouts, materials and roof additions. However, the chamfered corner feature and hipped roof design is present on both and is highly visible from within the public realm. It helps identify Nos 75 and 77 as prominent corner buildings and thus they contribute positively to the immediate street scene.
9. The loss of the chamfered corner and alterations to the roof would erode the established relationship with No 77. The introduction of a substantial gable elevation to No 75 would also be a dominant and visually incongruous feature in this part of the street scene.
10. A photograph of corner buildings has been submitted in support of this appeal and I viewed the buildings during my visit. Whilst they are not symmetrical, in a similar approach to Nos 75 and 77, both have been sensitively designed to reflect their corner locations and to prevent a harsh right-angle corner. As such, this does not serve to justify this appeal. The use of materials to match the existing building, provision of a cantilever support to ensure structural stability, and lack of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers would not overcome my concerns about the effect of the proposal.
11. Taking all the above into consideration, this proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area. It therefore conflicts with Policies 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan (March 2016), Policies D4 and D8 of the Publication London Plan (December 2020), SP1, SP3, SP7, S6 and H1 of the Newham Local Plan 2018, A 15 year plan looking ahead to 2033 (December 2018), and paragraphs 124, 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Collectively, whilst varying slightly in their wording, these policies seek to ensure developments are of a high-quality design and have regard to and contribute positively to local character. Policy D1 of the Publication London Plan relates to area assessments and planning for growth. It is not relevant in the context of this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

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

Joanna Gilbert
INSPECTOR