



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/24/3354455

79 Woodford Road, London E7 0DL

- 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 Mrs Monica Mimoglu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application ref. is 24/00456/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension, ground floor rear extension and roof alteration to the existing property, and the conversion of ground floor commercial (Class E) use to facilitate the provision of x3 self-contained residential units (Class C3) with associated cycle and refuse storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the:
 - character and appearance of the area and
 - the living conditions of future occupiers with particular regard to outlook, privacy, defensibility and amenity space

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. This angled corner site comprises a two-storey Victorian end-terrace with dual pitched roof. The gable faces Bective Road, a side road from which it is set in at an angle, the gap filled by a wedge-shaped single-storey flat-roofed extension. A two-storey outrigger to the rear steps in from the side road. The main elevation has a ground floor bay window and decorative gable atop a pair of first floor windows. The ground floor contains a shop and a three-bedroom flat occupies the first floor and attic.
4. The site is on the edge of an area of terraced housing, some with bay windows, some in London stock brick with stone dressings, some rendered and altered. The house on the equivalent corner plot on the next street to the north is set in from both frontages, whereas that to the south is built to the pavement and has a mansard roof. Consequently, whilst sharing similar format and height, changes, such as the application of render, have diminished consistency and the appeal site is somewhat unusual in possessing a decorative gable facing to the main road. Across the main road, a large area of parkland adds variety to the context.

5. The proposal would convert the shop, replace its flat-roofed element with a two-storey side extension with a mansard roof over, and build a single-storey extension to the rear of the outrigger. This would create a studio, a one-bedroom and a three-bedroom flat. Cycle and refuse storage would be provided to the rear.
6. The proposed roof extension would incorporate flat and pitched sections. Mansard roofs exist at the junction with the next street to the south, but there are none nearby that combine flat and pitched sections. In limited views, the proposed roof might read solely as a mansard, but its hipped form and corner siting would ensure its depth, as well as its steep pitch and height, would be readily perceived.
7. Whilst the proposed roof extension will be no higher than that to 81 Woodford Road across the side road, it is the proposed massing and form in combination with the height that would appear disproportionate and compromise important features of the existing building, such as the decorative gable. As the appellant suggests, an increase in height at the end of the terrace has some precedent in the area, but this does not alter my view in respect of the harm that would be caused by the overall effect of the height, massing and form.
8. For these reasons, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policies D1 and D3 of the London Plan (2021) and London Borough of Newham Local Plan (LBNLP) (2018) Policies SP1 and SP3, which require an understanding of character and response to context, designs that respond to distinctive features. Whilst cited in the reason for refusal, Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan (2021) and LBNLP Policies S1 and SP8 deal with design analysis, public realm, spatial strategy and neighbourly development, in respect of which I find no conflict on this issue.

Living Conditions

9. The flats on the upper floors would have no external amenity space. Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) requires this. However, the site is very close to a large area of parkland and the flats are of a size such that children are unlikely to live in them. Similarly, whilst the external amenity space available to the ground floor flat would be limited, it would similarly be adequate in the context of the location. These factors mitigate the harm arising from the conflict with this policy.
10. The ground floor front corner bedroom would face Woodford Road and adjoin Bective Road with windows to both. The two windows to Bective Road would be obscure glazed and, as such, offer privacy but no outlook.
11. A single window to Woodford Road would not be obscured and would therefore offer some outlook. However, it would face an open area at the back of the pavement, which would not be defensible space and so would not afford future occupiers adequate privacy from passersby.
12. The ground floor rear bedroom would adjoin Bective Road, on to which it would have an obscure glazed window, again offering privacy but no outlook. It would have a further small window on to a small wedge of rear garden, across which it would have good outlook but limited privacy from the street.
13. Whilst there is a habitable room fronting the street at 77 Woodford Road, there is a small garden area between its window and the street providing defensible space and therefore greater privacy, which would not be the case for the proposed

ground floor corner bedroom at the front. Furthermore, whilst an obscure glazing condition may have struck a balance between outlook and privacy in the case at 26 Renters Avenue, NW4 3RB, I do not have full details of that case, and it would not deal with the lack defensible space. In any event, each proposal must be determined on its own merits, as I have done in this case.

14. In light of the above, and notwithstanding the provision of amenity space, the proposal would not provide a suitable standard of living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to privacy. It would, therefore, conflict with Policies GG4, D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) and LBNLP Policy SP8.
15. Whilst identified in the reason for refusal, LBNLP Policies S1, SP1, SP2, SP3 and H1 deal with spatial strategy, place-making, healthy neighbourhoods, urban design and mixed communities, in respect of which I find no conflict on this issue.

Conclusion

16. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that would cause me to determine the appeal otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR