

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11th September 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/17/3179106

40 Second Avenue, Manor Park, London, E12 6EH.

- 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 Mr Abdus Samad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref: 17/01294/HH, dated 14 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a mid-terraced property with a typical bay window arrangement to the front. To one side of the bay a porch has been erected which projects slightly forwards of the bay and has a similar pitched roof. The appeal proposal would see the porch retained but with a lower roof.
 4. Because of the size of the porch relative to the bay window, and its projection forwards of it, it appears as an ungainly and bulky addition to the property. Its shape and form seek to mimic that of the bay window, but in a somewhat crude fashion. The fact it has been constructed across the side of the bay window obscures the architectural detailing of the original property, which is one of its defining characteristics. The proposed reduction in the height of the roof would serve only to exacerbate this impact by introducing a contrived and alien roof form to the property frontage.
 5. I recognise that there were no objections to the application from neighbouring occupiers, but that does not render the proposal acceptable on its planning merits. I also fully understand the appellant's case that many occupiers of nearby properties have carried out porch extensions and it has to be said that many of these are far from sympathetic. However, without knowing the
-

histories of those cases, I cannot be certain that they have secured planning permission or otherwise been condoned by the Council. Moreover, the thrust of the design advice in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) seeks to secure high quality design in recognition of the importance the Government attaches to the quality of the built environment. Allowing an unsightly development merely because there is unsympathetic development nearby would not accord with these aspirations to make places better for people.

6. For these reasons, I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would fail to satisfactorily integrate with the host property, thus detracting from the character and appearance of the area. It would thus conflict with the guidance in the Framework, together with Policies 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Policies S6, SP1 and SP3 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) and Policy SP8 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan: Detailed Sites and Policies Development Plan Document (2016). These seek to secure urban design of the highest architectural quality, which builds on the positive elements of the area to contribute to establishing an enhanced character to the streetscape and improve housing quality.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR