



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by **H Marriott MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/25/3368152 **347 Manor Road, Stratford, London E15 3AN**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Amy Ferguson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 25/00377/PREHHA.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed upward extension, floorplan redesign and all associated works at 347 Manor Road'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO), permits development consisting of the enlargement of a dwellinghouse consisting of the construction of (a) up to two additional storeys, where the existing dwellinghouse consists of two or more storeys; or (b) one additional storey, where the existing dwellinghouse consists of one storey, immediately above the topmost storey of the dwellinghouse, together with any engineering operations reasonably necessary for the purpose of that construction.
3. Development is permitted under Class AA subject to limitations and conditions specified under AA.1. and AA.2. including a requirement that the developer applies for prior approval to the Local Planning Authority following the procedure set out in AA.3. The Local Planning Authority may refuse the application where it considers that the proposal does not comply with the limitations or restrictions that are applicable to such permitted development.
4. The Council's reason for refusal states that the proposed development would fail to comply with AA.2(3)(a). Specifically, the Council raise concerns in relation to AA.2(3)(a)(ii) regarding the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of – (aa) the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse. Case law has found that it is a matter of planning judgment as to whether consideration is given to the effect in terms of the building's intrinsic design and/or to the effect in terms of the building's relationship with adjoining or nearby properties¹.

¹ Cab Housing Ltd & Ors V Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities [2022].

5. Having read the Council's Officer Report, there appears to be no dispute between the main parties that the proposed development would comply with all other limitations and conditions specified under AA.1. and AA.2, including AA.2(3)(a)(i) relating to the impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises and AA.2(3)(b) relating to construction management. Based on the evidence before me, I find no reason to disagree.
6. Therefore, the main issue is whether prior approval should be granted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the GPDO, having particular regard to the effect of the proposed development on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

7. Manor Road is a main route containing a mix of residential and commercial development and provides access to both West Ham Railway Station and Star Lane Underground Station. Although the railway line runs parallel to Manor Road, the part of the Manor Road and surrounding streets near the appeal site are primarily residential in character. While the dwellings vary in design, they are generally two-storeys in height. This consistency in scale, height and form contributes positively to the cohesive character and appearance of the area.
8. No 347 has been previously extended² and forms one half of a semi-detached pair with the adjoining dwelling (No 1) orientated towards Gainsborough Road. Despite this difference in orientation, the pair maintain a balanced and symmetrical appearance, which reflects the prevailing characteristics of the area.
9. The proposed additional storey would increase the overall height and massing of No 347. As the adjoining dwelling at No 1 is two-storey and there are no other three-storey buildings in the immediate vicinity, the proposal would result in a jarring increase in height that would appear starkly out of keeping with its context. Although the use of matching materials, roof pitches and fenestration pattern is proposed, these design elements would not sufficiently assimilate the visual impact of the increased bulk. The resulting building would appear incongruous, disrupting and unbalancing the established symmetry of the semi-detached pair. While taller buildings are visible further along Manor Road, their presence a greater distance away does not alter my assessment of the proposal's failure to respect the external appearance of No 347 and the character and appearance of the immediate locality.
10. I conclude that proposed development would result in a harmful effect to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse. Accordingly prior approval should be refused under Class AA of the GPDO. The proposal would also conflict with design policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), including Paragraph 135 which requires development to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

11. The proposed development would provide additional living space for a growing family and would maximise the use of the site in an accessible location. The appellant's consideration of matters such as fire risk and emergency access are also acknowledged. Furthermore, the appellant has referred to the development

² Council refs: 19/01659/HH and 97/1045

plan and general support for residential extensions. However, these are not matters that can be considered in the context of an application for prior approval, which is limited to the provisions of the GPDO. While the Framework may be relevant, this is only in so far as it is relevant to the prior approval matters as set out in my reasoning above. Accordingly, these wider considerations do not alter my decision.

12. The Council previously refused planning permission to raise the ridge height and the addition of a dormer at 347 Manor Road (No 347)³. An appeal against this decision was subsequently dismissed in December 2024 (the 2024 appeal)⁴. As the 2024 appeal was for a different scheme and did not relate to an application for prior approval, the findings of that Inspector have not been determinative in this appeal.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Marriott

INSPECTOR

³ Council ref: 24/00888/HH

⁴ Appeal ref: APP/G5750/D/24/3351026