



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2025

by **R Gravett BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/24/3355033

20 Jasper Road, West Beckton, Newham, London E16 3TR

- 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 Ms Zewdi Mehale against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 24/01416/HH.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 20 Jasper Road (No 20) is a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling located on one side of a broadly 'U' shaped arrangement of similar dwellings which front onto an amenity area. Opal Close wraps around the terrace and much of the rear elevation of No 20 is therefore visible from this road. Jasper Road is part of a wider residential area which has a very close-knit urban grain but has a clearly considered and carefully designed layout which results in an attractive and cohesive character and appearance.
4. The rear elevation of the terrace is slightly staggered, but the proposed single storey rear extension to No 20 would have a depth of around 3m, projecting well beyond the established building line. It would extend the full width of the rear elevation and would have a flat roof which, combined with its depth, would result in the extension appearing 'boxy,' unsympathetic to the considered proportions of the host dwelling, and the wider terrace. Further, despite a relatively low eaves height, the scale of both the flank and rear elevation of the extension would be unduly prominent from Opal Close, clearly visible above the boundary fence. The proposed extension would appear a disproportionate addition, contrary to guidance in the Council's *Altering and Extending your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2018)* that any new extension should be subservient to the original dwelling. It would also fail to respect the layout and form of the surrounding area to the detriment of the cohesive character and appearance I have described.
5. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of extensions to dwellings within the surrounding area considered similar to the appeal proposal. I have been

provided with no further information, so I do not know the exact scale of these extensions or the circumstances under which they were built. However, I did observe on my site visit that the rear elevations of these dwellings are not as prominent from the road as the rear elevation of No 20. Consequently, I find the examples provided by the appellant lend very little support to the proposal before me and, in any event, each case must be considered and determined on its individual merits.

6. Therefore, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would conflict with policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan (2021) (LP) in so far as they require high quality design and development which enhances local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness. It would further conflict with policies SP1, SP2, SP3, SP5 and SP8 of the Newham Local Plan 2018 (2018) (NLP) which together also require high quality housing and design, positive design impacts and development which reinforces positive local distinctiveness and contributes to townscape.
7. LP Policy D1 relates principally to defining character in order to plan for growth and I do not therefore find it relevant to the proposed householder extension before me. Similarly, I do not find NLP Policy S5 relevant because it sets out overarching strategic principles and the vision-based spatial strategy for Beckton.

Other Matters

8. I recognise that the construction cost may be similar for an extension smaller than the one proposed, and that the resulting internal space may not be sufficient for the appellant, but these are not matters which outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

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

R. Gravett

INSPECTOR