



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/25/3359937

21 Avenons Road, Plaistow, Newham, London E13 8HU

- 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 Linas Vaisvidas against the decision of the London Borough of Newham Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02427/HH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of roof extension over first floor outrigger extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Subsequent to the Council's decision, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) (the Framework). I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issues in this appeal. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my decision with regard to the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a mid-terrace two storey house that has been the subject of a flat roofed first floor rear extension above an original outrigger and a rear dormer extension at loft level. It is located with a terrace of modestly scaled houses that reflect the wider character of the local area.
5. The proposal is for a flat roofed dormer extension above the existing rear outrigger, which would connect to and integrate with the existing rear dormer extension to the main roof of the appeal dwelling. This would be to the same height as the existing dormer extension and approximately 2 thirds of its width, requiring alterations to the fenestration of the existing dormer. The proposal would be set back slightly from the flank side of the existing first floor extension and would extend rearward by approximately 3.4 metres, amounting to over half the roof area of the existing first floor extension.

6. The box like massing, and rearward extent of the proposal would result in the appearance of the existing and proposed dormers creating a single large 'L' shaped dormer. Whilst the existing rear dormer to the main roof of the appeal dwelling is set back from the eaves, the proposed dormer would extend over the eaves to connect the with existing dormer and integrate with it to its full height. This would result in a visually disjointed connection and discordant stepping between the two elements, as the proposal transitions between the flat roof of the first floor extension and the main roof of the appeal dwelling.
7. Due to its extent and scale, the proposed dormer extension would appear as a large and dominating addition that would fail to appear as a secondary and subordinate to the appeal dwelling. The proposal would, therefore, appear as overscale and incongruous in relation to the character and appearance of the existing modestly scaled terraced house.
8. Whilst first floor outrigger extensions are evident in the immediate local area, there is little in the way of dormer extensions and none above 2 storey outriggers that I could see on my site visit. Whilst only visible in rear views from surrounding properties, the scale, rearward extent and massing of the proposal would result in the appeal dwelling appearing overscale and discordant in relation to neighbouring houses and the established character and appearance of the local area.
9. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. This would be contrary to Policies SP1, SP3 and SP8 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan (2018), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 12 of the Framework. Collectively these seek development that is of a high quality design, securing integration and coherence with local context.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR