

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2016

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 03 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/16/3153864

166 Canonsleigh Road, Dagenham, RM9 4DB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs A Bibi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 16/00574/FUL, dated 18 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is '*Double storey side extension with hipped roof over. Single storey rear extension with flat roof.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has not raised any objections to the single-storey rear extension proposed as part of the scheme. I agree with this approach and, as such, I will limit my assessment to the proposed two-storey side extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms one half of a distinctive pairing of semi-detached dwellings and associated curtilages; the other being No 200 Woodward Road. Straddling the corners of the two roads, both dwellings have gable features fronting their respective streets, and the buildings then turn inwards to meet at a central point. The proposed two-storey extension would project the dwelling's frontage across to the common boundary with No 168 Canonsleigh Road, and would be overlain with a hip-ended roof. Flush with the front building line the design would incorporate bay windows at ground and first floor levels to reflect those as currently exist in the unextended dwelling.
 5. Policy BP11 of the Council's Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) requires that the design of buildings and the layout of new development should, amongst other things, protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area. More specifically, in relation to householder
-

developments, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extensions and Alterations guidance' (SPD) comments in paragraph 5.4.3 thereto that the character of a semi-detached house is partly derived from the symmetry it has with its adjacent twin, and a side extension can significantly alter this balance. The appeal proposal represents a typical case in point, and the proposed extensive physical alterations would be an anomalous form of development which, due to its positioning at the junction of two roads, would be of particular visual prominence in the streetscene.

6. The significant expanse and width of the development would not only damage the relationship between the appeal property and its twin, it would also result in an awkward juxtaposition with No 168, due to the extension's height relative to No 168's roof profile. I do not consider that the intended hip-end would temper what would be a difficult physical relationship between the two dwellings.
7. Further, in terms of general principles, house extensions should show a degree of subordination to the host dwelling, which is often demonstrated by the addition being recessed from the front building line and also, in relation to two-storey side extensions, that they be set down from the main ridgeline. Notwithstanding the symmetry issue in relation to its immediate neighbour and the resultant relationship with No 168, this unduly prominent extension would exacerbate such incongruity.
8. Although, as mentioned, there is no objection to the single-storey rear extension proposed as part of the scheme, due to the nature of the proposal, as shown on the submitted plan, the two elements are not severable. In illustration, the proposed dining room at the rear would open out into the side living room, which is part of the two-storey side addition. As such, on the basis of the plans before me, I am unable to grant planning permission for the rear extension by way of a split decision.
9. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would be in material conflict with the aims and requirements of Core Strategy Policy CP3, DPD Policy BP11 and relevant advice within the Council's SPD.
10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR