



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/25/3362221

40 Addington Road, Canning Town, Newham, London E16 4NG

- 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 Andrea Turner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref. is 24/02620/HH.
 - The development proposed is an L shaped dormer and a raised ridge to facilitate a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and the street scene of Addington Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terrace house on the southern side of Addington Road. The Officer's Report refers to the area being comprised of Victorian dwelling houses of a similar architectural design and historic proportions including the roof forms. Although the appeal statement refers to the removal of the bay window at No. 40, from my visit to the appeal site and its surroundings I am satisfied that there remains a sufficient degree of consistency in Addington Road to seek to retain all of the building's distinctive qualities as a Victorian dwelling in the appraisal of development proposals.
4. The Council's objection relates to the effect of the proposed development on both the front and the rear of No. 40 and the terrace to either side. As regards the front, the Council's concern relates to the raising of the ridge by 0.33m. And clearly given the existing continuity of the ridge line, any changes thereto require careful scrutiny to avoid any harmful effect on both the dwelling itself and the street scene.
5. However, I am satisfied that because of the combination of (i) the additional ridge height being modest; (ii) the continuation of the roof pitch beyond the current ridge line towards the rear and (iii) the increased height remaining below that of the side parapet walls, the development would not be a jarring feature in the street scene. The retention of the original chimney stack is also helpful in this regard. Overall, I am not persuaded that the Council is correct to claim that the increase in the ridge

- height would appear 'significantly' higher than the rest of the terrace and disrupt its symmetry and harmony.
6. In principle the effect of the development on the rear of the property and the terrace along this side of the road might reasonably be argued to be of lesser importance because it does not form part of the public realm. There is a disagreement between the parties as to the extent, if any, the rear roof of No. 40 including the outrigger can be seen in public views and from my visit I was unable to reach a firm conclusion on the point.
 7. Be that as it may, it is clear from the aerial photograph in the appeal statement that on the southern side of Addington Road all of the houses have their original roof form and outriggers (and given the absence of any reference to alterations on behalf of the appellant presumably this also applies to the northern side). There are examples of comparable roof alterations to the appeal scheme at 53 Star Lane; an end of terrace property on Durham Road, and on the corner of Hilda & Desford Roads. However, a total of three represents only a very small proportion of the houses in this aerial view and in my view is insufficient to have changed the character and appearance of the area.
 8. Furthermore, in contrast to the effect on the front of the terrace, I wholly endorse the Council's view that the proposed dormer would consume the majority of the outrigger roof and introduce a larger flat roof addition at roof level to the height of the extended ridgeline. The scale and form of these bulky additions would be noticeably unsympathetic to the original roof form of the Victorian house and the terrace as a whole. Even if not prominent in the public domain, the rear elevations of the individual dwellings and the wider terrace are important to the character and appearance of the area and can be seen from a number of private vantage points in Addington Road and Star Lane.
 9. Overall, and notwithstanding its limited impact on the street scene, I find that the appeal proposal would be harmfully out of keeping with the host dwelling, the terrace on the south side of Addington Road and its wider surroundings. As such, it would conflict with Policies SP1, SP2, SP3 & SP8 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan 2018; the Council's 'Extending Your Home' SPD 2018, and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2024.
 10. I have taken account of the draft legislation on roof extensions and examples of roof alterations granted permission in other parts of the Borough. However, I do not consider that either of these are of sufficient weight to alter my decision which I have made having regard to the particular effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its context of the terrace on this side of Addington Road.
 11. The appeal therefore fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR