



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2019

by Christopher Miell MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/19/3220431

92 Heigham Road, East Ham, London E6 2JQ

- 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 Mazhar Mahmood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 18/01985/HH, dated 9 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2018.
 - The development is described as a retrospective planning application for a front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The porch has been erected and therefore I am considering this appeal as a retrospective development.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework was revised in February 2019 (the Framework). I have taken the Framework into account as part of the determination of this appeal.
4. The Council has included policies from the Draft London Plan within their decision notice. In accordance with paragraph 48 of the Framework, weight may be given to policies within emerging plans. The weight given is determined by the stage of preparation of the emerging plan, the extent of unresolved objections and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies to the Framework. I have not been provided with any substantive details of the status of this emerging plan, and therefore I attribute the plan and policies very limited weight as a material planning consideration.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two-storey terraced dwelling from the Victorian period with a double bay window on the front elevation and a recessed entrance. The building has a buff brick and render exterior under a red tile roof.
7. The surrounding area has an urban residential character and the properties on Heigham Road are predominately two-storey terraced Victorian dwellings.

Whilst there are differing Victorian styles present within the street, i.e. square bay windows and canted bay windows, the proportionality of the dwellings and the building line of the bay windows remains generally consistent, which results in a design balance and symmetry that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

8. The proposal is for a single storey porch, which has a buff brick and timber effect panelled exterior under a red tile roof. The porch protrudes forward beyond the ground floor bay window and extends from the side boundary of the property to the edge of the middle window within the bay. As a result, the side of the bay window is encompassed by the porch and is therefore no longer visible from the street.
9. The porch has been built using materials to match the existing property and the ridge of the porch sits below the stone brackets of the window sill above. These are positive design features. Nonetheless, the overall scale of the porch is excessive in the context of the proportions of the host building. Furthermore, the projection of the porch beyond the bay window and its encompassment of the side section of the bay window significantly and unacceptably diminishes the architectural integrity of the host building.
10. In addition, owing to the forward projection of the porch beyond the building line of the bay window and the neighbouring properties and its overall scale, the development appears unduly prominent and incongruous in the locality and hence fails to satisfactorily integrate into the street-scene. As such, the development causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. The appellant points out that there are several properties on Heigham Road with porch extensions which vary in terms of design and sizes. Whilst I accept that there are other porch extensions present within this long street, overall this is the exception rather than the norm. Furthermore, along the stretch of Heigham Road where the appeal site is located, they are limited in number and hence this part of the street is generally characterised by simple and flat frontages to properties. As such, I have afforded the existence of other front extensions in the street limited weight in the overall planning balance.
12. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the development does not accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (March 2016); Policies S6, SP1, SP3 and SP8 of the adopted Newham Local Plan (2018); advice contained within the Altering and Extending your Home Supplementary Planning Document (February 2018) and Chapter 12 of the Framework which collectively require new development to complement and enhance the character of the host building and protect the character and appearance of the existing area through high quality design.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Christopher Miell
Inspector