



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2021

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/21/3272894

41 Latimer Road, Forest Gate, London, E7 0LQ

- 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 Mrs Jesusa Bazan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 21/00005/HH dated 30 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of mansard roof. The proposal to match 109 Sebert Road, E7 0NL.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terrace dwelling that has been extended to the rear.
 4. The appeal property is located in a residential area, largely characterised by the presence of two storey terraced dwellings. Dwellings are set back from the road behind short gardens and the appeal property, like other dwellings along the same side of Latimer Road, has a long garden to the rear.
 5. The regular set-back and the presence of bay windows, ornate plaster-work and common roof-lines provides for an attractive uniform quality to Latimer Road.
 6. During my site visit, I observed that the roof of the terrace within which the appeal property is located has an unbroken parapet fronting the street. Further, to the rear, the terrace is distinguished by the presence of a highly attractive butterfly roof form, visible above rear outriggers. Together, these features contribute a significant, distinctive and attractive sense of place to Latimer Road.
 7. The proposed development would result in a new mansard feature over the existing roof, close to the front elevation of the property. The lack of a significant set-back would result in the mansard appearing to protrude above
-

the parapet and I find that this would result in a visually discordant development, to the detriment of the attractive, uniform appearance of Latimer Road in this location.

8. Further to the above, the proposed mansard would have a flush rear elevation and a vertical rear wall. I consider that this would combine with proposed changes above the outrigger to result in a development that would serve to obscure the attractive, original butterfly roof form. In contrast to the elegant, original form of the appeal property, the proposed development would, I find, draw attention to itself as an unduly large, “boxy” and unsympathetic addition. In addition, the proposal would result in an irregular and somewhat awkward juxtaposition of roof forms which would appear out of keeping with local character.
9. To a small degree, the identified qualities of the terrace’s roofscape have been eroded by a neighbouring dormer extension located in close proximity to the appeal property and I find that the harmful impact arising from the proposed development would be exacerbated as a result of it appearing as an additional incongruous feature, out of keeping with the otherwise generally cohesive and attractive original form of the terrace.
10. Taking all of this into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policies D1, D3 and D4; and to Newham Local Plan (2018) policies SP1, SP3 and H1, which together amongst other things, protect local character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR