



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2021

by G Rollings BA (Hons) MAUD MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/21/3277163

83-87 Belgrave Court, Prince Regent Lane, Plaistow, London, E13 8RP

- 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 Prince Regent Properties Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 20/02240/FUL, dated 12 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a front dormer roof infill to allow for additional internal headroom and to match existing rear elevation at existing 3rd floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front dormer roof infill to allow for additional internal headroom and to match existing rear elevation at existing 3rd floor at 83-87 Belgrave Court, Prince Regent Lane, Plaistow, London, E13 8RP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/02240/FUL, dated 12 October 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-971-MB-01 rev. 0; PL-971-MB-02 rev. 0; PL-971-MB-100 rev. 0; PL-971-MB-101 rev. 0; PL-971-MB-200 rev. 0; PL-971-MB-201 rev. 0; PL-971-MB-202 rev. 0.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken into account the parties' representations on the updated *National Planning Policy Framework* (2021) (the Framework), and *The London Plan* (2021) which supersede the versions that were in force at the time of the Council's decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The existing building comprises three storeys of residential accommodation, with an additional storey contained within the roof space. This is served by six discrete dormers on the front elevation, each with a window facing Prince

Regent Lane, and two longer dormers on the rear elevation, with limited visibility from surrounding areas.

5. The proposal involves filling the gaps between dormers on the front elevation, to create one long dormer across the length of the front elevation. Fenestration would remain as existing. Although not identical to the rear elevation, the effect of the long dormer would be similar to that of the two longer dormers on the rear, albeit with larger windows in the front elevation.
6. The appeal building is set back from Prince Regent Lane, and views towards it are limited by neighbouring buildings, which are set closer to the street. The appeal plans indicate that the extended dormer would have the same set-ins from the roof edges as the existing multiple dormers, which appear subservient to the overall roof plane. Although the extended dormer would appear larger than the existing ones, the roof plane would remain visible.
7. My observation of the rear dormers indicated that these do not appear to be overly bulky or obtrusive. The presence of larger windows in the front dormer, compared with the rear, would mean that its mass would be relieved by the greater glazed areas. As such, I am not convinced that the proposal would represent the unacceptable increase in bulk and massing described by the Council.
8. There is a mix of building types along Prince Regent Lane, particularly along the busy section around the site, and no one style of building predominates. As such, in combination with the above considerations, the proposal would not appear out of character nor obtrusive in the context of the building or the street scene. I acknowledge the Council's concern that the development may create a precedent, but given the general absence of existing front dormer windows in the street and the need for bespoke approval, I do not consider this to be a strong prospect.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area. There would be no conflict with the *Newham Local Plan 2018* Policies S1, S6, SP1, SP2, SP3, SP8, or H1, or London Plan Policies D1 or D4, which together require development to have a high design quality, amongst other considerations. These are consistent with the Framework. I have had regard to the Council's adopted *Altering and Extending your Home Supplementary Planning Document* (2018) in my decision.

Conditions

10. No conditions were suggested by the parties, and given the detail on the appeal plans, no further conditions are required beyond the statutory conditions, which are included to provide certainty and in the interests of proper planning.

Conclusion

11. The proposal complies with the Framework and the development plan for the area, and there are no material considerations to indicate that permission should not be granted. The appeal is allowed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR