



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 April 2021

**by L Perkins BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19 July 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/20/3259739**

**87 Forest Lane, Stratford, London E15 1RW**

- 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 Miss Maho Akita of Akita Komar Architects against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
  - The application Ref 20/01316/HH, dated 24 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2020.
  - The development proposed is described as: L-shaped loft conversion with mansard roof extension to create additional bedroom.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. I have dealt with 2 other appeals on this site, relating to applications for lawful development certificates. These are the subject of separate decisions<sup>1</sup>.
3. At my site visit I was able to see the rear of the appeal property from the public highways to either side. From these public vantage points it was clear that the rear outrigger had been almost entirely demolished.
4. Since the Council issued its decision a new version of the London Plan has been published. So the London Plan policies published in 2016, referred to in the decision notice, have been superseded by those in the London Plan 2021. Both main parties have been given an opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal and any comments received have been taken into account in my reasoning.

### Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the appeal development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

6. The area includes a mix of housing types but is predominantly characterised by rows of 2 storey terraced houses, many of which have a butterfly roof and a rear outrigger set below the rear parapet level. The appeal property is one of a short terrace of 6 such properties, the rears of which are clearly seen from the

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/G5750/X/20/3259734 and APP/G5750/X/20/3263555

- roads perpendicular to either end of the terrace, as well as from neighbouring properties to the rear.
7. The appeal proposal includes a mansard roof extension over the main house and a dormer roof extension over the rear outrigger. The Council's decision raises no issues with the mansard roof extension and, based on the evidence provided, I see no reason to either. However, the proposed dormer roof extension would be large and bulky and would be an unsympathetic addition to the appeal property's rear outrigger. No other rear outriggers in this group have been extended in this way and so the dormer extension would be incongruous in this context.
  8. My attention has been drawn to roof extensions on Nos 90 and 91 Forest Lane. But from the information available to me, neither of these developments included a dormer roof extension over the rear outrigger, so they make no difference to my conclusion in this case.
  9. From the 2 other appeals I have dealt with on this site, I am aware of 2 other proposals for an extension over the rear outrigger and I have given consideration to these as part of this appeal. But given the extent of demolition which has occurred, which I saw on my site visit, I am not satisfied there is a real prospect of either of the other proposals being pursued. This is because the demolition which has occurred constitutes a material change in circumstances for those 2 other proposals, since they were made, and so I have given them limited weight in this decision.
  10. I conclude the proposed rear dormer roof extension over the rear outrigger would harm the character and appearance of the area. So it would not comply with Policies SP1 and SP3 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan 2018 (the Local Plan), the Altering and Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document, February 2018 or the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework in this regard.
  11. The Council has also referred to Policies D1, D4 and D8 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies SP2, SP8 and H1 of the Local Plan. But it has not been explained how these are directly relevant to the appeal development or the main issue in this appeal. So in my view these policies weigh neither in favour of nor against the appeal development and in my view the appeal development conflicts with the development plan overall.

## **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*L Perkins*

INSPECTOR