



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 09 September 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/25/3369712**

**8 Sidney Road, Forest Gate, Newham, London, E7 0EF**

- 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 Ivan Fernandes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
  - The application Ref is 25/00715/HH.
  - The development proposed is a double loft conversion including a roof terrace over the rear addition, front-facing dormer, single-storey rear extension with a pitched roof, and outbuilding with a pitched roof.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to a double loft conversion including a roof terrace over the rear addition, front-facing dormer and outbuilding with a pitched roof.
2. The appeal succeeds insofar as it relates to a single-storey rear extension with a pitched roof at 8 Sidney Road, Forest Gate, Newham, London, E7 0EF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00715/HH, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following condition:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision;
  - 2) 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.

### Procedural Matters

3. The Council has no objections to the proposed single-storey rear extension and this is taken into account in the decision above. The main issue considered below focuses on the other elements of the proposal.
4. An application for a lawful development certificate for a rear dormer roof extension was approved in 2025<sup>1</sup>. This lawful development certificate is for a different form of development to the double loft conversion including a roof terrace over the rear addition and front-facing dormer that form part of the proposal the subject of this appeal.

---

<sup>1</sup> Reference: 25/00592/CLP.

## **Main Issue**

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

## **Reasons**

6. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terraced bay-fronted dwelling. It is set back from the street behind a paved area used for parking and has a garden to the rear. Beyond the rear garden is a large parkland area.
7. The appeal dwelling is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of two storey terraced houses. Houses tend to be set back from the street behind low walls and small front garden areas and have larger gardens to the rear. These factors, the presence of street trees and views through to the extensive adjacent parkland area provide for a sense of spaciousness and greenery.
8. Like other rows of terraces in the area, the terraced row within which the appeal dwelling is situated comprises brick-built dwellings with attractive bay window features at ground and first storey height. Whilst I observed during my site visit that dwellings have been altered and/or extended over the years, such changes tend to appear in keeping with the appearance of host dwellings and this factor, together with the rhythmic appearance of the terraced dwellings, provides for a strong and attractive sense of uniformity.
9. Further to the above, with the exception of the presence of a single front-facing dormer which, the Council has pointed out, does not benefit from planning permission, the front roof slopes of the terraces around it tend not to be broken up by the presence of dormers. This is a factor which adds to the area's strong sense of uniformity and it also helps to emphasise the attractiveness of the bay window designs, which are a distinguishing feature of the area.
10. The proposed front dormer would draw attention to itself as a large, box-like addition to the front roof slope. Its high, forward-facing position would result in it drawing the eye as an incongruous and unsympathetic feature, out of character with the surrounding area where, with the exception of the single dormer referred to above, no such additions exist.
11. Consequently, I find that the addition of a front dormer as proposed would erode the area's uniform attributes. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated by it forming a visual link with the existing front dormer within the same terrace, further interrupting the prevailing roof form, to the detriment of the area's distinctive sense of uniformity.
12. Whilst I note above that the appeal property benefits from a lawful development certificate for a rear dormer roof extension, the proposed double loft conversion including a roof terrace over the rear addition would involve the creation of a large roof terrace in a dominant position, high up on the property. The visual impact of this large feature would be increased by the presence of a tall, extensive privacy screen intended to protect residential amenity.
13. I find that the overall scale of the terrace with its tall and extensive privacy screen would result in it drawing attention to itself as a large, somewhat bulky and dominant feature, unlike any other in the immediate area. It would appear incongruous, rather than as a subservient addition.

14. Outbuildings at the end of gardens, adjacent to the large parkland to the rear, are a common feature this part of Sidney Road. Their low, flat-roofed form results in their appearing as garages and/or outbuildings ancillary to and subordinate to the appearance of, host dwellings. Unlike these, the proposed outbuilding would appear as a tall structure with a pitched roof.
15. I find that the significant height of the proposed outbuilding would result in it failing to appear subordinate to the host dwelling. Rather, it would draw undue attention to itself as a tall, dominant and incongruous feature, out of keeping with its surroundings.
16. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policy D3; and to Newham Local Plan (2018) Policies SP1 and SP3, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

### **Conditions**

17. I have considered the conditions against the tests set out in Paragraph 57 of the Framework. I find that a condition specifying materials is necessary in the interests of local character.

### **Conclusion**

18. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed insofar as it relates to a double loft conversion including a roof terrace over the rear addition, front-facing dormer and outbuilding with a pitched roof, but it succeeds insofar as it relates to a single-storey rear extension with a pitched roof.

*N McGurk*

INSPECTOR