



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/25/3362303

2 Eclipse Road, Plaistow, London E13 8LX

- 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 A Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 24/02545/HH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension and a two storey side extension with associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the erection of a two storey side extension with associated internal alterations. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted in so far as it relates to the erection of a single-storey rear extension at 2 Eclipse Road, Plaistow, London E13 8LX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/02545/HH, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans in so far as they relate to the development hereby permitted: 2ER(01) rev A, 2ER(02) rev A, 2ER(05) rev A, and 2ER(06) rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey end of terrace house situated next to the junction between Eclipse Road and Denmark Street. The front of the house faces the former street and the flank wall is a conspicuous feature in views along the latter. Like other houses in the terrace the appeal property has a 2-storey outrigger to the rear and includes a single storey rear addition. It occupies a triangular site and therefore benefits from a larger garden than its neighbours. Planning permission

was granted in 2020 for construction of a single storey rear extension and a two storey side addition. This permission has lapsed.

4. The appeal proposal would comprise the erection of a 2-storey side erection that would wrap-around part of the existing rear elevation, and a single-storey addition to the rear of the outrigger. The former would extend the same distance beyond the original main elevation as the existing outrigger and would mirror the roof and form of the original outrigger.
5. The information before me indicates that the proposed side addition would be smaller than that approved in 2020 and would be set further away from the side boundary of the site. Whilst the proposed side addition would be a prominent feature in views along Denmark Street, long flank elevations on the return side of corner sites are a common feature of terraced housing and in this particular location I am satisfied that such development can be accommodated without unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
6. However, the first floor wrap-around part of the proposal would result in an almost flat rear elevation which would appear contrived and incongruous in the context of a terrace that largely retains its original form with outriggers extending a regular distance from the main rear elevation. Due to the size, siting, massing and appearance of this element the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of both the host building and its surroundings.
7. For these reasons the proposed side and wrap-around extension fails to accord with Policies SP1 and SP3 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan (2018), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which collectively seek development that is of a high quality design, securing integration and coherence with local context.
8. The proposal also includes a modest single storey addition with a flat roof to the rear of the existing outrigger. This would be subservient and proportionate to the main dwellinghouse and would respect the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and surroundings. As such this element of the proposal accords with the aforementioned policies. It is physically and functionally severable from the other part of the proposal and therefore a split decision can be issued allowing this part of the proposal.

Conditions

9. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider a materials condition is required to safeguard the appearance of the area. Furthermore, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings is imposed.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail in respect of the proposed two-storey side extension and succeed in respect of the single-storey rear extension.

S Poole INSPECTOR