



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2025

by **A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/25/3368199

145 South Esk Road, Forest Gate, London E7 8HE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Salina Uddin against the decision of London Borough of Newham Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00647/HH.
 - The application is for erection of a ground floor rear extension, refurbishment of the basement with new window and light well, along with erection of front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid terrace house within an area of mostly similar such buildings. The house is currently painted white with a bay window which sports neo classical features in the form of ornate capitals. The front door itself also exhibits similar architectural motifs that are common in the area. To the rear there is an existing single storey ground floor extension which serves an existing kitchen and that leads into a fairly narrow and linear rear garden. To the far end of the back garden there is also an existing single storey flat roof outbuilding that backs onto the rear boundary.
4. The proposal before me seeks to extend the single storey rear extension further into the rear garden whilst at the same time creating a basement conversion with lightwell to the front. Further to this a porch would be created that would protrude over the existing front door and would subsume part of the existing bay window.
5. As alluded to above, I consider that the front bay window represents an element of architectural flamboyance on what are otherwise simple terrace houses. In this respect the details here, modest as they are, represent an element of architectural quality within the area that it is desirable to maintain.
6. Although some such features have unfortunately been lost locally, this has eroded some of the remaining special character that is important for the design understanding and identity of the area. The proposal before me would follow this example and, rather than being a porch, the front extension would dominate and

erode the distinctive character of the streetscene through the loss of architectural features and the subsuming of the bay window.

7. Although I consider the light well could be made to work subject to detailed design, the combination of the two elements is not obviously separable. As such the overall effect is one that would be harmful to the character of the streetecene which still maintains a rhythm and articulation in detail that would be very difficult to replace.
8. With regards the rear extension, in many ways this would improve the living conditions of those within the house as it would enable the spaces within to be more joined up and lit from roof lights above. The flat roof protrusion would therefore not, in principle, be in conflict with the development plan.
9. However, due to the existing outbuilding that currently exists, together with the extra rearward extension, the proposal would compound development here and would see nearly all of the rear open space developed under buildings. This would remove the opportunity for an open area of any quality to be maintained and would cause harm to the character of the area whereby the open space would be lost.
10. As a result the proposal would represent an overdevelopment of this plot to such an extent as to cause harm to the character of the area. Although there may be ways to extend in a more modest fashion, perhaps with the removal of the existing outbuilding, the proposal before me would be in conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan, Policies SP1 and SP3 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan and the Altering and Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Conclusion

11. The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and, for the reasons given above, whilst taking into account all other matters raised, I must dismiss this appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR