



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2022

by Peter White BA(Hons) MA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/21/3288664

214 Kempton Road, East Ham, London E6 2PB

- 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 Yashvant Ravdiya against the decision of London Borough of Newham Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02312/HH, dated 14 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is planning application for retention of front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my visit, the development had commenced. I have nevertheless considered the development shown on the submitted plans as a proposed development as it shows the development as it would be completed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Kempton Avenue is a street of terraced dwellings set back around a metre from the footway behind low brick walls. The dwellings on Kempton Avenue all feature a bay window and lean-to porch canopy facing the road on the ground floor. Some porches have been enclosed but retain their simple character. Despite not being designated as a Conservation Area, the uniformity of design and its features is unusually high. This uniformity of design contributes to the character of the area, and at my site visit I saw no examples other than the appeal site which diverge from the established form.
5. The proposed development is a porch of similar footprint to the original lean-to porch, and that recently approved as an alternative development, but with a higher gabled roof with a feature-panelled gable end.
6. I note the smart appearance of the development under construction, and that the porch would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Nevertheless, I consider the proposed development would introduce a distinctly different design into this area which is characterised by its uniformity. The solid side walls, greater height, gabled pitched roof design, and feature panel above

the door would detract from the established architectural detailing in this location.

7. The Council have referred to examples of other developments provided by the appellant previously and which they state are not close to the appeal site, some of which may have been permitted development, and some had been in place for some time. I have not seen any evidence that these examples are comparable.
8. I therefore conclude that the development would erode the distinctive character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to the relevant provisions of The London Plan (2021) Policy D3, London Borough of Newham Local Plan (2018) Policies SP1 and SP3, which require designs to respond positively to local character and distinctiveness, and with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character. It would also conflict with the recommendations in the London Borough of Newham Altering and Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2018).
9. I have not found conflict with The London Plan (2021) Policies D1, D4 and D8, which relate to development plans and assessments, design delivery, and the public realm, London Borough of Newham Local Plan (2018) Policies S1 and S6, which relate to strategic matters, or SP8 which relates to neighbourly development.

Conclusion

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

Peter White

INSPECTOR