



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2025

by **C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/25/3365483

72 Pitchford Street, Stratford, London E15 4RX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Tolutope Ayo-Yusuf against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 24/00892/FUL.
 - The development proposed is construction of rear extension, loft conversion with rear dormer extension with Juliet balcony, roof lights to front elevation to facilitate first-floor duplex flat, internal reconfiguration and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is in a residential neighbourhood predominantly comprising terraced homes of modest proportions, although there is some variation in dwelling design in the wider area. The existing building occupies a prominent corner plot at the intersection of two streets. Its two principal façades of equivalent dimensions, chamfered corner façade and hipped roof mark the corner of the block and thereby integrate the perpendicular terraces on either side. This configuration also complements the former public house at No 70, on the opposite corner. The rear of the appeal premises with its modest ground floor extension are clearly visible from Widdin Street. Overall, the existing building makes a positive contribution to the traditional and intimate character of the surrounding residential neighbourhood.
4. The proposed change in ridge height and roof form would severely diminish the symmetrical proportions and design integrity of the appeal premises. This would be further weakened by the removal of the chimney stack; and by the stepped appearance of the three extensions, which in combination would overbear the rear of the building in a very visible location, notwithstanding the setbacks proposed. The asymmetrical position of the proposed rear dormer and poorly aligned fenestration on the rear façade would also aggravate the incoherent appearance of the altered building. Overall, the proposed extensions and alterations would together have a very deleterious effect on the appearance of No 72, which would undermine the building's pivotal role at the corner of the block and thereby erode cohesion in the character and appearance of the neighbourhood.

5. I recognise No 70 is a taller building and the proposed ridge height at No 72 would be lower than this. However, No 70 is a distinctively detailed three storey structure designed to stand out in the neighbourhood and provide a foil to surrounding buildings. No 72 is a complementary two-storey corner building. Therefore, I am not persuaded by the argument that the proposed increase in ridge height at No 72 would be justified by the height of No 70, such that it would be compatible. The functional explanation for the proposed design, and the suggestion that it adds architectural variety, are also not supported by sufficiently convincing evidence to overcome the harms I have identified.
6. Whether or not each extension on its own would represent a modest addition to the building, the scheme before me comprises all three, which in combination would be detrimental for the reasons I have set out.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area. This is contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, which supports optimisation of site capacity where this responds positively to existing building types and local character. It is also contrary to Policies SP1 and SP3 of the Newham Local Plan 2018, which seek high quality development that secures integration and coherence with the local context. Further, it is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, where it seeks developments that are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. The proposed development would increase the size of internal accommodation in the two flats and improve their energy efficiency, which would support development plan objectives. However, there is no compelling evidence the appeal scheme would be the only way in which qualitative improvements to the existing dwellings could be achieved. A biodiversity uplift is proposed but there is very little to substantiate this. Alone or in combination, these benefits of the proposal are insufficient to outweigh the harm to character and appearance I have found.
9. The Council is satisfied in relation to effects on neighbouring occupiers. On the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree. However, an absence of harm in this respect is a neutral factor.
10. I appreciate the appellant has sought to engage positively with the Council and respond to pre-application advice. Nevertheless, the amendments would still result in a proposal that would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area for the reasons I have already outlined.

Conclusion

11. I have found the proposal conflicts with the development plan, read as a whole. No other material considerations, including the Framework, have been shown to indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

C Carpenter

INSPECTOR