



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2024

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/23/3332909

92 Glenavon Road, Stratford, Newham, London E15 4DD

- 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 ZAP Architecture against the decision of the London Borough of Newham Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01784/HH, dated 11 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey wraparound extension and a first floor extension. Installation of a Juliet balcony to the rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice as this is a concise and accurate description, which has also been used by the appellant for their statement.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework has been revised subsequent to the decision made by the Council on the planning application to which this appeal relates. I have therefore made my decision with regard to the National Planning Framework (December 2023) (the Framework).

Main Issue

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area; and
 - The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a two storey end of terrace house with existing rear ground floor and rear box dormer roof extensions. It sits on a corner site at the junction of Glenavon Road with Faringford Road, where the gable end of the property sits directly adjacent to the footway. It is located in a residential area, primarily made of similar terraced properties, the majority of which have undergone some form of alteration and extension, particularly to their rear.

6. The terraced houses in the area, including the appeal dwelling, are compact and tightly spaced with single storey rear outshoots and small rear gardens/yards. There are only limited parts of extensions that sit at first floor level, mostly the mono-pitched roofs of existing ground floor outshoot extensions. The proximity of properties, small gardens and outshoot extensions leads to the appearance of the area being densely developed.
7. The proposal includes a ground floor wraparound extension to the existing rear extension. This would result in a combined rear extension structure with a part flat and part mono-pitch roof form with 3 roof lights towards Faringford Street. The enlarged rear extension structure would extend rearward to the rear boundary of the appeal site with 95 Vernon Road and sideways to the street boundary of the appeal site with Faringford Road. At first floor a flat roofed rear extension is also proposed, which would be the same width as the existing ground floor extension and would extend 3 metres from the first floor rear elevation of the appeal dwelling.
8. The roof lights in the mono-pitched part of the proposed ground floor extension and the proposed larger window and Juliet balcony to the existing dormer would appear to be positioned and designed to appear as secondary and recessive, and would not, therefore, appear detrimental to the existing character and appearance of the appeal dwelling. However, due to the compact nature of the appeal dwelling and the density of local development, the bulk, height and box like massing of the proposed extensions would result in them appearing to be out of proportion to the appeal dwelling and its plot. They would, therefore, appear to dominate the appeal dwelling and to not appear as secondary or subordinate additions.
9. The combination of the proposed rear extensions would infill much of the remaining limited space to the rear of the appeal dwelling at ground level and would also infill part of the limited space at first floor between the terrace of which the appeal dwelling forms part, and the terraced houses that back onto it. This would have the effect of accentuating the appearance of the density of local development, which would be particularly evident in views from Faringford Street.,
10. From these viewpoints, the extent and scale of the proposed extension would be particularly apparent and would lead to the appeal dwelling appearing as over scaled for its plot and to infill the space to the rear of the terraces. The box like massing of the proposed extensions would also not reflect the pitched roofs visible to outriggers to the rear of the dwellings in the terraces. As a result, the appeal dwelling would appear unduly prominent, dominating, and incongruous in relation to the existing pattern of development and local streetscape.

Living Conditions

11. The proposed extensions would align with the boundary between the appeal dwelling and No.90 and be to the full depth of the rear gardens of this neighbouring property. Although the proposals would change the existing mono-pitch roof form of the existing rear extension, resulting in one area at ground floor where the height of the proposed roof would be lower than existing, the proposal would also add greater depth to the ground floor extension structure. At first floor, the proposed extension would also add greater height than existing. On balance, the proposed extensions would appear from the rear

- room and rear garden of No.90 as overbearing, enclosing and intrusive and would be experienced by its occupiers as oppressive.
12. The height and rearward extent of the proposal would also result in a loss of direct sunlight and daylight to the rear ground floor rooms and garden of No.90. The proposed first floor part of the proposed extensions would also have a similar enclosing effect on the first floor rear rooms of No.90 and would, likewise result in an oppressive presence that would be further accentuated by the resulting reduction in sunlight and daylight. However, given the distances involved, the proposed extensions would not result in any significant change to the outlook from 88 Glenavon Road.
 13. The appellant has drawn attention to existing rear extensions in the local area, many of these appear to be of some age and I have only limited information provided on their planning background. Whilst these appear to generally vary in design from the proposed extensions, they do appear to result in detrimental effects similar to those of the proposal that I have identified above. Planning policy and practice develops over time, and these extensions would have been considered on their own individual merits where a consent was sought. I have done likewise in my consideration of the proposal, which is a main tenet of the planning system.
 14. The appellant has set out their reasons for the proposal in relation to their family needs. However, the proposal does not appear to be the only way that such needs could be accommodated. I have, therefore, only afforded this moderate weight in my considerations.
 15. The appellant has also raised concerns with regard to communication with the Council. However, there are other procedures in place that relate to such matters, and these are not issues for me to consider as part of this appeal.
 16. For the reasons given above, the proposal, when considered as a whole, would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area, as well as substantial harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. This would not accord with the guidance set out in the Newham Altering and Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2018) and would conflict with Policies SP1, SP3 and SP8 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan (2018), Policies D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135 of the Framework. These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions and alterations, is of a high quality design, securing integration and coherence with local context, and do not undermine the quality of life of neighbours.

Conclusion

17. The benefits of the proposal are limited and of a primarily private nature, and I find that these do not outweigh the harm that I have identified. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR