



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2026

by S Burch BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/G5750/W/25/3375588

118 Barking Road, East Ham, Newham, London E6 3BD

- 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. Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Newham.
 - The application Ref is 25/01271/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'proposed single-storey part rear extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the vitality and viability of nearby designated centres.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a three-storey terraced property on Barking Road. A grocery shop occupies the ground floor whilst the upper floors appear to be in residential use. The surrounding area is characterised by similar three storey mixed use properties, apartment blocks and terraced dwellings.
4. Policies SP6, SP7 and INF5 of the London Borough of Newham Local Plan (2018) (NLP) seek, amongst other things, to focus main town centre uses in town and local centres in order to focus investment, economic growth and regeneration in such areas. Policies SD6, SD7, SD8 and E9 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) outline that the vitality and viability of London's varied town centres should be promoted and enhanced by, amongst other things, ensuring town centres are the primary locations for commercial activity. These policies outline that when considering development proposals, boroughs should take a town centres first approach, discouraging out-of-centre development of town centre uses.
5. The scheme would result in the expansion of a commercial use outside of a town/local centre. It would therefore be contrary to the above planning policies. It may be argued that the impact of the proposal on the vitality and viability of nearby town and local centres would be very low, however the cumulative impact of such incremental changes would have significant effects and would undermine the Council's development plan policies in terms of ensuring such developments are contained within town and local centres. Furthermore, the appeal proposal and potentially other forms of similar development would provide competition which would draw business activity away from centres.

6. Although the existing use is historically established, this does not justify noncompliance with the Councils policies. Additionally, whilst the extension may help improve the functionality of the commercial unit, I am not satisfied that the only way to do this would be through extending the premises. There is also no empirical evidence before me to demonstrate that without the proposed extension, the business would be rendered unviable.
7. Overall, for the reasons set out above, the proposal would undermine the vitality and viability of town and local centres. It would be contrary to Policies SP6, SP7 and INF5 of the NLP and Policies SD6, SD7, SD8 and E9 of the LP.
8. Whilst the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) supports business investment, expansion and adaptation, it also discusses the importance of promoting the long-term vitality and viability of town centres. The scheme would therefore conflict with the aims and provisions of the Framework, when taken as a whole.

Other Matters

9. My attention has been drawn to an appeal decision (Ref: APP/G5750/W/18/3193222). There were a number of main issues in that appeal and the Inspector found harm regarding the proposals effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and the vitality and viability of local and town centres nearby. Whilst the scheme before me would be acceptable with regard to urban design and its effect on neighbouring amenity, an absence of harm in these respects would be requirements of any well-designed scheme and they do not carry positive weight in favour of the appeal proposal.
10. The property is not a listed building and is not located within a Conservation Area. It also may benefit from good public transport accessibility, and the scheme may comply with various other policies in the NLP and LP. These are however neutral considerations and do not weigh in favour of, nor against the appeal.

Conclusion

11. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict.
12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

S Burch

INSPECTOR