



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2025

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/24/3354591

112 Lonsdale Avenue, East Ham, Newham, London E6 3JX

- 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 Mr Raja Altaf against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 24/01436/HH.
 - The development is a front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the appeal was lodged the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated. I am satisfied there are no changes of any consequence for the main issues in this appeal.
3. Reference to “retention” in the description of the development on the application form is not an act of development and I have removed it from the description set out in the banner heading. On the basis of my site visit it appears that the development has been completed and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

4. The effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupants of 110 Lonsdale Avenue, with particular reference to outlook and daylight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The residential character of the area derives from the predominance of terraced housing from the early- to mid-20th century. There has been little by way of physical alteration to the properties. There are some porches on other dwellings. However, their number and frequency do not have a significant effect on the appearance of the street and the prevailing character is a repeated pattern of pitched-roof bay windows and paired front doors with tiled canopies. The façade of the terrace is predominantly red brick or rendered at ground floor and rendered at first floor. The bay windows and pitched canopies form strong building lines and a

rhythm of architectural elements that can be seen along the length of the terrace. To the front of each property is a modest garden space predominantly contained by brick walls with a pedestrian access. Seen in combination, these elements result in a consistent and attractive form of development.

6. I have not been provided with evidence of the appearance of the appeal property prior to the construction of the porch other than the drawings submitted with the application. The plans show that prior to the development the appearance of the dwelling was consistent with the predominant appearance of the area.
7. The porch is a marked change to the appearance of the appeal property. It stands forward of the established building line, subsuming the existing bay window. A single pitched roof now extends across the width of the façade, above and forward from the otherwise consistent pattern of bay windows and entrance canopies. Furthermore, the flank wall of the porch, adjoining No 110, presents a blank elevation at right angles to the terrace façade that interrupts the visible pattern of projecting windows and canopies. The use of yellow bricks is at odds with the prevailing materials used along the terrace. Consequently, the porch has a significant and detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area.
8. Taking all the above into account, I find that the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. I therefore find that the development conflicts with Policies H1, SP3 and SP8 of the Newham Local Plan and Policy D3 of the London Plan. Together these seek, among other things, to ensure high quality design and development makes a positive contribution to the area and reinforces local distinctiveness through its scale, appearance and shape.

Living Conditions

9. The height and depth of the porch limits the open aspect previously enjoyed from the front of No 110 and leads to a feeling of enclosure when entering and leaving the property. There is a window between the front door serving No 110 and the boundary. Although there may have been some loss of light to this window as a result of the construction of the porch there is limited evidence to demonstrate this would have a significant effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 110. Consequently, I find that the porch has a harmful overbearing effect on the living conditions of occupiers of the neighbouring property due to its scale, mass and proximity.
10. Taking the above into account, while I have not found that the porch is harmful in terms of loss of daylight, it does result in a harmful enclosing effect to the detriment of the living condition of the occupiers of No 110. I therefore find that the development conflicts with Policies H1, SP3 and SP8 of the Newham Local Plan and Policy D3 of the London Plan. Together these seek, among other things, to ensure development, through its scale, appearance and shape, minimises overbearing effects.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR