
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2016

by H Baugh-Jones BA(Hons) DipLA MA CMLI

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

Decision date: 18th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/16/3154769

113 Hunters Hall Road, Dagenham RM10 8LH

- 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 Mr Nicolae Vasile against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 16/00694/FUL, dated 6 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side extension and a two storey rear extension and a part single storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. I have used the description of development given on the appeal form as this most accurately reflects the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area with particular regard to the Hunters Hall Road street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling located within an area comprising a mix of terraced and semi-detached houses. Whilst there is some variation in the buildings lines between groups of dwellings, gaps between them have remained largely unchanged and although some have had minor fascia and fenestration alterations, development along Hunters Hall Road has maintained a clear identifiable rhythm. In combination with the overall uniform hipped roof appearance of most dwellings, this creates a distinctive street scene.
5. Extensions to the dwelling have been granted on appeal¹. Whilst the previous appeal decision is clearly a material consideration, I do not have the full details of it before me or thus, the considerations that led the Inspector to conclude that the proposal was acceptable. Consequently, I cannot be certain that the previous scheme is directly comparable to the current appeal proposal. In any

¹ Ref: APP/Z5060/D/15/3136180

case, I have determined the appeal on its individual merits based on the evidence before me and my own observations on site.

6. I noted the introduction of a gable end and a very substantial rear dormer that extends to the flank of the dwelling to create a part pitched and part flat roof. These substantial alterations to the dwelling's appearance have significantly diminished its original character and the roof itself appears disjointed and out of character with its neighbours. This is very noticeable in the street scene because of the existing gap between the appeal property and that next door.
7. Although the proposed side extension would be of relatively modest width, it would have a small hipped roof that would rise only modestly above eaves level. Consequently, it would not visually tie in to the existing roof form. This disharmonious relationship to the current, albeit out of keeping roof would further erode the appearance of the dwelling and harm the street scene.
8. Furthermore, although not all proposed elements would be readily seen in public views, the totality of the proposed extensions including the additions at first floor level at the rear of the dwelling would exacerbate the clear identified harm to its character and appearance.
9. Consequently, I consider the proposal would run counter to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Council's Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) (BWDP). Amongst other things, these policies require development to have regard to local character and contribute to its distinctiveness including through high quality architecture. I also consider the proposal would conflict with the design principles set out in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD). Whilst the BWDP and the SPD pre-date the Framework, I consider them to be in general accordance with its requirement for good design.

Other matter

10. I have considered the Council's argument that the current proposal would set a precedent for similar developments in Hunters Hall Road. Whilst each application and appeal must be judged on its individual merits, I can appreciate the Council's concern that approval of this proposal could be used in support of such similar schemes given the existing spaces between end terraces and the potential for utilising the roof spaces of the dwellings. Allowing this appeal would make it more difficult to resist further planning applications for similar developments and I consider that their cumulative effect would exacerbate the harm which I have described above.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Hayden Baugh-Jones

Inspector