



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by **D Ellis MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/25/3370483

The Bay Tree, 59 Vicarage Lane, Stratford, Newham, London E15 4HG

- 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 Room Board Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 24/01451/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a third floor extension, a three storey rear extension to accommodate additional hotel rooms (16 to 35 en-suite bedrooms), a basement conversion creating a light-well to accommodate a beer garden and refurbishment of the existing building including amenity space, green wall, solar panels and pub retention.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The principle of the proposed development, with particular regards to the existing use of the building as a community facility and the effect of the proposed additional hotel accommodation on the vitality and viability of the Stratford Town Centre;
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area;
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regards to daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy and noise and disturbance; and
 - Whether the proposal would provide adequate cycle storage.

Reasons

Principle of the proposed development

3. The appeal building consists of a public house on the ground floor and sixteen hotel rooms on the floors above. Although there is a separate entrance door which provides access to the hotel rooms, there is an internal door which connects the hotel lobby to the public bar area. The proposal would see the addition of nineteen further hotel rooms and the reconfiguration of the public bar area on the ground floor and basement level. There would be no divide between the hotel entrance

and the ground floor bar area. Both the existing and proposed layouts include at least one dedicated public entrance to the bar area.

4. Notwithstanding the Council's concerns, I have no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that the operation of the altered building would differ from the existing situation. I am therefore not persuaded that the proposal would result in the loss of a public house.
5. The appeal site is situated within the Vicarage Lane Local Centre, which is a short distance from Stratford Town Centre and has a 'good' public transport accessibility level rating. NLP Policy SP6 has regard to successful town and local centres and states that town and local centres should be vibrant and vital and should be successful in social and economic terms. The policy also supports visitor facilities in such centres as appropriate to their size and function.
6. NLP Policy INF5 sets out the need for Stratford town centre to maintain its role and function as a Metropolitan Centre and progress towards an International Centre role, and LP Policy SD7 encourages a 'town centres first' approach. Nevertheless, these policies do not preclude hotels in Local Centres.
7. As a result of this proposal, the appeal property would have 35 hotel rooms, which would be appropriate to the size and function of the Vicarage Lane Local Centre given its proximity to Stratford Town Centre and public transport level. Furthermore, the number of hotel rooms would not be large enough to negatively affect the role and function of Stratford Town Centre. Moreover, the additional hotel rooms would support the economy of the Local Centre.
8. For these reasons, the proposal would not result in the loss of a public house, would be of an appropriate scale for the Local Centre and would not undermine the role and function of Stratford Town Centre. The proposal would therefore accord with NLP Policy INF8 and LP Policy HC7, insofar as they seek to protect community facilities including public houses. There would also be no conflict with NLP Policies SP6 and INF5 and LP Policy SD7.

Character and appearance

9. The appeal site comprises a three-storey pub and hotel on a corner plot between Vicarage Lane and Ham Park Road. The appeal property is at the end of a commercial parade, and the surrounding area consists of a mix of residential and commercial uses. The appeal building has two ground floor bay windows facing Ham Park Road and sash windows on the upper floors, with architectural detailing around the windows. Bay windows are a common feature of the properties in Ham Park Road, and the exterior materials, architectural detailing and roof form of the appeal property complement the surrounding buildings. Overall, the property has an attractive and distinctive appearance which contributes positively to the character of the area. This is enhanced by the building's highly prominent corner location.
10. The proposed mansard roof would effectively add a fourth storey to the building. Whilst it would be similar in height to the buildings on the opposite side of Vicarage Lane and on the opposite corner of Vicarage Lane and Ham Park Road, as a result of the mansard roof the building would dwarf the adjoining properties in the terrace and the properties immediately behind in Ham Park Road. Furthermore, the mansard roof would not be in keeping with the surrounding roof forms. While

the submitted drawings are unclear as to the colour of the exterior cladding for the mansard roof, a condition could be used to require the submission and approval of these details. Notwithstanding this, the mansard roof would be an incongruous addition as a result of its design and massing.

11. The bay windows, which are characteristic of the properties in Ham Park Road, would be removed to make way for a sunken outdoor beer garden. The loss of the bay windows at this prominent building at the entrance to Ham Park Road would be detrimental to the built form of Ham Park Road. Furthermore, the submitted drawings appear to show the beer garden would be surrounded by a fence, which would result in the enclosure of an area which is currently open and contributes to the spaciousness to the frontages of the building, which comes from the wide pavements outside the building.
12. Although the approved development at the Cart and Horses in Maryland Point¹ involved a significant extension of up to seven storeys to the original building, the Cart and Horses is a detached building. The appeal property is part of a terrace where the other buildings are two-storeys in height, and as such I am not persuaded that the Cart and Horses development is directly comparable to the scheme before me. The appellant has also referred to the nearby Quadrangle House building at 84 Romford Road. Again, I have few details of the circumstances of the roof extension on this building which is a cumbersome addition compared to the architectural qualities of the original host building. Accordingly, I am not persuaded that the circumstances at Quadrangle House should set the pattern for development at the appeal location.
13. For these reasons, and while full regard may have been given to inclusive design principles, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies SP1 and SP3 of the Newham Local Plan 2018 (NLP) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) (LP), insofar as they require developments to be of a high-quality design which respect the positive elements and distinctive features of the borough.

Living conditions

14. The appeal property would be extended to the rear towards 2 Ham Park Road (No 2). Although there would be a void for a light well immediately adjacent to the outrigger at No 2, the three-storey extension and mansard roof would be built up to the boundary adjacent to part of the rear garden of No 2. There are two rear-facing windows and three side-facing windows and a side-facing door at the rear of No 2, although two of the side-facing windows are obscure-glazed. Even if the separation distances across to the rear are entirely consistent with accepted standards and despite the presence of the void for the light well, the very close proximity and substantial height of the proposed extension these rear windows and the door at No 2 would undoubtedly suffer from a significant reduction outlook and an increased sense of enclosure.
15. The extension would also project considerably beyond the first-floor elevation at 61 Vicarage Lane (No 61), and the height and massing of the extension would significantly reduce the outlook from the nearest first-floor rear window at No 61.

¹ Planning application ref. 17/02285/FUL

However, as the appeal property is situated to the north of No 61, the extension would not result in a significant loss of daylight to the rear windows at No 61.

16. There are currently three hotel bedroom windows which face towards the rear and garden of No 2. The proposal would result in eight bedroom windows in the proposed light well which would face towards the rear elevation and outrigger at No 2. Although there is existing overlooking of No 2, the number of additional windows together with the proximity of the light well to the boundary would result in a substantial increase in overlooking of the windows in the rear elevation and outrigger at No 2. A condition requiring these new windows to be obscure-glazed would prevent any meaningful outlook from these windows, to the detriment of future occupiers.
17. The proposed beer garden would be modest in size and would replace an existing outdoor area with tables and chairs. The increase in hotel rooms could increase the number of people using the pub, however the hotel guests would likely return to their rooms rather than go into the street. Overall, the beer garden and the increase in hotel guests would not result in any significant increase in noise and disturbance. Furthermore, conditions could be used to mitigate noise and disturbance from the appeal property and to restrict the hours that the beer garden could be used.
18. The proposal would therefore accord with LP Policy D14, which seeks to reduce, manage and mitigate noise and to avoid significant adverse noise impacts. However, as a result of the reduction in outlook for the occupiers of Nos 2 and 61 and the increased overlooking of No 2, the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. The proposal would therefore conflict with NLP Policy SP8 and LP Policy D3, insofar as they require developments to minimise overlooking, loss of privacy and an overbearing effect.

Cycle storage

19. The appellant states that accessible short-stay cycle stands would be situated near the building entrance, although these are not shown on the submitted drawings. Notwithstanding this, a condition could be used to secure appropriately located cycle stands.
20. However, the long-stay cycle storage for staff would be located in the basement. Whilst cyclists using the hotel entrance would have to carry their bicycles through a small part of the ground-floor pub lounge area, cyclists using the pub main entrance would have to carry their bicycle through the full length of the lounge area. Cyclists would then have to carry their bicycles down a U-shaped stairwell and make a further turn at the bottom of the stairwell to get to the cycle storage area. As such, even if sufficient cycle parking would be provided in the basement, it would not be convenient to access. The proposal would therefore not provide adequate cycle storage.
21. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with NLP Policy INF2 and LP Policy T5, insofar as they require developments to provide high-quality measures to encourage and facilitate cycling, including cycle parking facilities.

Other Considerations

22. The appellant states that the existing 16-room configuration is no longer financially sustainable, however no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate this. I therefore afford this matter very limited weight. The proposal would however support the economy of the Local Centre and could provide employment opportunities, to which I afford moderate weight in favour of the scheme. However, this would not be sufficient to outweigh the harms identified above.

Conclusion

23. I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

D Ellis

INSPECTOR