



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2024

by V Goldberg BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/24/3339068

4 Barry Road, Beckton, Newham, London, E6 5TA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Jahanara Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 23/02132/HH.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two-storey side and part rear extension including alterations to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. Barry Road is characterised by modest two storey red brick properties, with small gardens as part of a densely populated estate. The properties have unaltered tile hung pitched roofs and most retain their original footprint. The uniform building lines and unaltered roofs positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
4. Access to a parking court serving the estate adjoins the property. A footpath that runs behind Barry Road, adjoins the parking court. Views of the rear and side of the appeal property can be gained from both the parking court and footpath.
5. The proposed development will envelop and unacceptably dominate the host property. Only a small section of the original rear elevation will remain legible and therefore the proposal fails to be subservient or respect the original proportions of the property. The design of the extension appears particularly awkward due to its proportions and differing roof forms which emphasise the bulk and mass of the proposal.
6. The roof of the proposed two storey rear extension will appear as a discordant and incongruous feature, jutting above the eaves and introducing a roof pitch at odds with the original. In addition, as the proposed development will impinge on the small garden, this will further emphasise its bulk and mass.
7. The proposed development will not be visible from Barry Road and views from the parking court and footpath would be obscured by a deciduous tree.

However, the rear elevation can be viewed through the vegetation, and in winter when the tree has no leaves, views of the rear of the property will be less impeded. Views of the side of the plot from the parking court are open and the proposed development viewed from this angle would appear incongruous.

8. The appellant argues that setting back the proposed development from the shared boundary and the separation distance from the footpath, adequately mitigates the additional bulk. In my view, the separation distances are minimal, and the development will be clearly visible as detailed above. In addition, despite the development not protruding significantly beyond the rear building line, the depth combined with the two-storey side extension and the design of the development, result in an extension that fails to respect the host property.
9. Given the short depth of the garden, the bulk and mass of the development would dominate the rear elevation and reduce the quality of the private outdoor amenity space.
10. For the reasons identified above, I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host property. The proposed development is therefore contrary to London Plan Policy D3, Policies SP1 and SP3 of the London Borough of Newham's Local Plan (December 2018). These policies require that new development is of a high quality which positively responds to local distinctiveness in terms of its scale and to the specific attributes of the site. The development is also contrary to the SPG 'Altering and Extending your Home' (February 2018) in so far as it seeks to ensure development complements and enhances the host property and is subservient to the original house.
11. The Council refer to London Plan Policies D1, D4 and Local Plan Policies H1 and SP2. These in turn refer to capacity for growth, design quality on larger schemes, healthy neighbourhoods and building sustainable mixed communities, all of which are not relevant to the main issue in this appeal.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.

V Goldberg

INSPECTOR