



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6TH January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/21/3284676

135 Essex Road, Manor Park, London, E12 6QR

- 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. K Kansal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref 21/00947/HH, dated 19 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor addition and rear dormer to second floor new entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr. K Kansal against the Council of the London Borough of Newham. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to an end of terraced 2 storey house on a bend in the road. Houses within the terrace are set back from the footway behind low brick walls. They have relatively narrow front elevations with 2 storey bay windows to the side of a front door. Front doors would originally have been recessed but several have been moved forward, flush with the front elevation, or have projecting front porches. The appeal property is slightly higher than its adjoining neighbour and the front door is set back where the building extends to the side of the property. There is an existing single storey side extension which sits behind, and is largely obscured by, the boundary wall on the bend in the road.
5. There is a significant gap between the appeal property and the nearest house, 141 Essex Road. This enables views of the side and rear of the appeal property over the top of the boundary walls which run along the pavement edge between the 2 houses. From most views, the house appears to be similarly proportioned

and well related to other houses within the terrace. It also clearly marks the end of the line of housing at the point where the road bends.

6. The proposed first floor extension would run to the side of the house over the ground floor extension at an angle following the line of the boundary wall and road. It would significantly widen the frontage, albeit at an angle, and would be comparable to adding another house to the end of the terrace. It would be out of proportion with the host dwelling and others within the terrace and, despite being below the main roof ridge, would dominate the building harming its character and appearance. The appellant's examples of development of a similar scale relate mainly to new houses, rather than extensions to existing ones, and are not therefore directly comparable with the appeal proposal.
7. The proposed dormer would extend along the rear roof. It would be clearly visible approaching the site from Rixsen Road and Warwick Road. I appreciate that other dormers are visible from the street, including at No 85 as indicated by the appellant. However, none that I saw would be as dominant as the proposed development which would appear elongated and out of proportion because it would extend beyond the existing roof to cover the roof of the proposed first floor extension.
8. The proposed front rooflights are different widths with the left side rooflight being significantly wider than existing and proposed windows on the house. As such it would appear out of proportion and discordant, particularly as most other houses within the street have unaltered front roofs.
9. The proposed front porch would be significantly wider than others within the terrace. I accept that it would be smaller and less obtrusive than the extension projecting from the front of the house opposite. However, the appellant has described that development as a converted garage which would suggest it was not a new structure, or an extension to an existing one as would be the case with the proposal. Also, the house is a different design to its adjoining neighbours, whereas the appeal site reflects the design of other houses within the terrace such that the proposal would be conspicuously out of keeping. Furthermore, the porch roof would be attached to the first floor extension which is an element of the proposal that I have determined would be unacceptable.
10. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and area and would therefore conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Policies D1, D3, D4 and D8 of The London Plan (2021) and Policies SP1 and SP3 of the Newham Local Plan 2018 which require high quality development which responds to local distinctiveness and contributes to a vibrant public realm. Policy S6 referred to in the Council's decision relates to the Plan's overarching strategic aims and spatial strategy and is not relevant to the proposal.

Other Matters

11. I have considered all other matters raised in support of the appeal, including the absence of public representations. However, they do not alter my view that the proposed development would be unacceptable.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR