



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2025

by S Ramsden BSc (Hons) MA MA IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/D/25/3373200

240 Monega Road, Manor Park, Newham, London E12 6TS

- 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 Elias Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application reference is 25/01099/HH.
 - The development proposed is for an existing loft conversion with rear and side dormer and roof lights to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At my site visit I observed that the development had taken place. The appellant states that the proposal is for the retention of the development as built. However, I observed some minor discrepancies and omissions between the built development and the drawings submitted. For example, the drawings do not show necessary elements such as guttering and downpipes, but these have been installed on site. I am required to determine the appeal against the drawings submitted, but note in my determination where there are discrepancies.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Monega Road is characterised by two storey terraced houses with pitched roofs. To the rear of each house is a projecting outrigger with a small external area in the return. Generally, the outriggers have mono-pitch roofs, handed with their neighbours. These sit at right angles to, and below, the ridgeline of the main building.
5. The rear box dormer is built to the ridge height of the existing main roof. It rises vertically off the rear wall of the host property, and occupies the full width of the building. The front face of the side box dormer, over the outrigger, also rises off the wall below. To the rear, the side box dormer has a nominal set back from the verge of the roof of the outrigger. The pitch of the roof on the outrigger has been altered and does not match that of the neighbouring properties, although this does not appear on the drawings submitted.

6. The vertical faces of the box dormers are tile hung with projecting white fascia boards. Square white plastic guttering and downpipes have been installed although these are not on the submitted drawings. Also not shown are white guttering on the elevations, between the tile hung dormers above and the existing pebble dash walls below, and an existing round, black downpipe that has been extended up the vertical face of the rear box dormer and projects above the level of its eaves.
7. Due to the scale of the box dormers and the lack of set backs from the side and rear walls, of the existing dwelling, they are overly dominant and inappropriate additions. The visually intrusive nature of the development is compounded by the poor detailing and contrasting materials. The box dormers fail to respect the character and appearance of the host property and have a wider harmful visual impact on the surrounding area. Although they do not impact on the street scene, the box dormers are a dominant feature on the rear elevation and do not appear as subservient to the host dwelling.
8. The prominent square white rainwater goods, the extended black downpipe, and the change to the roof pitch of the outrigger are not shown on the drawings and do not form part of the application. However, at my site visit I noted that they contribute to the discordant nature of what has been constructed. Their replacement with an alternative would not diminish the harm resulting from the form of the rear box dormers.
9. There are a number of rear dormer extensions in similar locations in the vicinity, but it is unclear whether or when these were permitted. As some of these have a similar harmful effect on the character and appearance of the buildings and surrounding area, they do not support the development in this instance. They do not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue set out above.
10. The development does not accord with the Council's Altering and Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document, 2018, which advises that any new extension should be subservient to the original house and demonstrate clear set backs from existing elevations.
11. The development also does not accord with paragraphs 129 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which taken together seek to ensure well-designed and attractive development which adds to the overall quality of the area.
12. The development is harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It is contrary to Policies SP1, SP3, and H1 of the Newham Local Plan, 2018 (the Local Plan), which taken together seek to deliver high quality development which enhances local character and distinctiveness.
13. The Council does not consider the impact of the development on neighbouring residents to be unacceptable, and accordingly I find no conflict with Policy SP8 of the Local Plan.
14. Policy S6 of the Local Plan is listed on the decision notice. This policy includes matters relating to overarching urban and spatial strategies, and it does not relate to decision making directly. Therefore, this policy is not determinative in my decision.

15. Policy D1 of the London Plan, 2021, is also listed on the decision notice. This policy includes matters relating to defining an area's character and understanding its capacity for growth in the preparation of development plans. Policy D4 of the London Plan is also listed, which includes matters relating to processes for the delivery of good design, such as design review panels. Neither relate directly to decision making and, therefore, these policies are not determinative in my decision.

Other Matters

16. No objections were received by the Council in response to the application, but this does not weigh in favour of allowing the appeal and does not diminish the harm that I have found on the main issue.
17. The appellant states that the proposal would provide much needed larger family accommodation and thereby would make more efficient use of existing housing stock. These are benefits which weigh in favour, but this does not justify the permanent harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area I have found in this case.
18. The appellant has asserted that a lack of enforcement by the Council against comparable developments establishes a precedent for the development. The existence of unauthorised development in the vicinity, or possible lack of enforcement by the Council in those cases, is not a reason on its own to allow unacceptable development. Enforcement against potentially unauthorised work on other sites is not a matter for my deliberation in the context of this planning appeal.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Ramsden

INSPECTOR