
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2025

by **R Lawrence BSc (Hons), PGDip (TP), MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/25/3364910

144 Boundary Road, Plaistow, Newham, London E13 9QG

- 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 Daniel Bloom of City of London Holdings and Investments Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 25/00141/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for a full award of costs has been made by Mr Daniel Bloom of City of London Holdings and Investments Limited against the Council of the London Borough of Newham.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site occupies a prominent corner plot at a road junction, with visibility from several adjoining streets. The existing building is a two-storey structure with a flat roof, which noticeably exceeds the eaves height of neighbouring properties. This roof form is atypical in the local context, where the prevailing character is defined by long terraces of traditional two-storey buildings with pitched roofs. While there are occasional flat-roofed structures nearby, these are generally single-storey ancillary buildings and do not share the same degree of prominence or visual impact.
5. The building is set back from the junction and pavement, with an area of hardstanding that creates a sense of openness around the building. This openness allows for views of mature London Plane trees along New City Road, which contribute positively to the street scene and provide visual relief in an otherwise hard-edged urban environment. The spatial arrangement around the building, including the tree and open forecourt, plays an important role in softening the built form and enhancing the public realm.
6. The proposed single-storey side extension would introduce a visually bulky addition to the building. Its roofline would exceed the height of the existing fascia boards

above the takeaway frontage, resulting in a structure that appears disproportionately tall relative to other single-storey ancillary buildings in the locality. Although windows are proposed on the southern elevation, the remaining elevations would be blank and featureless. Even the front elevation would present a substantial expanse of blank wall above the windows, which would appear visually discordant and poorly proportioned relative to the host building.

7. The extension would also introduce an additional inactive frontage facing the junction. While the existing building similarly lacks active frontage in this direction, the proposed extension would reduce the openness of the site, diminish views of the mature street trees, and increase the visual dominance of the building in views from the junction and surrounding streets. This would result in a more assertive and less sympathetic presence within the street scene, undermining the spatial and visual qualities that currently contribute to the character of the area.
8. The proposal includes a low boundary wall enclosing the currently open portion of the site for residential use. No details have been provided regarding surface treatment or landscaping within this area. Access to the enclosed space would be via the front of the building, limiting its usability for residents of the upper-floor flat. The low height and lack of enclosure would not provide sufficient privacy or a sense of ownership, and the wall may instead encourage informal use by passers-by or takeaway patrons. The design and layout also raise concerns about litter accumulation and anti-social behaviour, further undermining the intended residential amenity value of the space.
9. At the time of the site visit, the open space adjacent to the shop was being used for bin storage, presumably associated with the takeaway unit. Although there is a rear service yard, it is unclear whether it can accommodate the bin. However, given the identified harm arising from the proposed extension, it is not necessary to explore this matter further.
10. The appellant has referred to a previously dismissed appeal for a similar single-storey side extension¹. In that case, the Inspector found the character and appearance of the extension acceptable, noting that it followed the same roof type, design, and materials as the host building, and retained a meaningful separation from the footway. While consistency in decision-making is important, the current proposal differs materially. It relates to a residential extension; it creates an enclosed residential amenity area and presents a more prominent and inactive frontage. These differences justify a departure from the earlier conclusion regarding character and appearance.
11. Reference has also been made to the appearance of the terrace at 201–211 Boundary Road. However, this terrace comprises buildings of consistent form and style, with modest flat roof elements concealing pitched roofs behind. The single-storey projection at the junction with Lichfield Road is well set back and lacks the prominence of the appeal proposal. As such, it does not provide a suitable precedent.
12. Having regard to the above considerations, the proposed development would result in a visually intrusive addition to the host building, which would fail to respect the established character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would erode the openness of the site, diminish views of mature street trees, and introduce

¹ APP/G5750/W/24/3343510 decision dated 06 November 2024.

inactive and blank frontages that detract from the public realm. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies SP1, SP3, SP8 and S6 of the Newham Local Plan 2018 and Policies D1, D3, D4, D6 and D8 of the London Plan 2021. Taken together, and insofar as relevant, these policies require development to be well-designed, responsive to its context, provide usable, well-designed external spaces, and to contribute positively to both the character of the area and the quality of the public realm.

Other Matters

13. The appellant has referred to potential benefits of the proposal in relation to crime prevention and public safety. It is asserted that the existing open space within the site boundary facilitates loitering, unauthorised car parking, and anti-social behaviour. While the proposed enclosure may reduce opportunities for such activities, the effectiveness of this intervention is limited by the design and scale of the boundary treatment. Specifically, the low height of the proposed wall is likely to encourage informal use, such as sitting or gathering, and may inadvertently create a space prone to litter accumulation and visual clutter. These outcomes would undermine the intended improvement in safety and amenity.
14. Moreover, I am not persuaded that the enclosure proposed is the only or most appropriate means of addressing these concerns. Alternative design solutions could potentially secure the space without incurring the visual harm identified elsewhere in this decision. In the absence of a more comprehensive and context-sensitive approach, the claimed benefits in terms of crime reduction and safety do not outweigh the adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

15. 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.
16. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Lawrence

INSPECTOR