

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2016

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20TH December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/16/3159858

42 Beccles Drive, Barking IG11 9HX

- 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 Jaspal Bhogal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 16/00760/FUL, dated 19 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with a rear dormer and hip to gable alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey end of terrace house which, like its unattached neighbour, has been extended to the side. It is located in a residential street comprising short terraces of similar age and design. A key feature of the terraces is their hipped roof forms, which is a matter to which I attach significant weight.
 4. The proposal would extend the property's roof by forming a gable to the side and a dormer to the rear. This would enable the provision of additional living space in the roof. I note that due to the neighbouring property, which steps forward of the appeal property slightly, the gable would be largely hidden in views looking along the street. However the extended roof would be clearly apparent looking front-on from Oulton Crescent, from where the entirety of the terrace and the hipped ends of the terraces to either side can be seen. In this context the roof addition would be a prominent and incongruous element that would be out of keeping with, and detrimental to, the appearance of the terrace and the surrounding area.
 5. I conclude therefore that, as a consequence of its siting and size the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policies BP8 and
-

BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) (BWDP) which, amongst other matters, expect development to have regard to the local character of the area and respect local context. It is also contrary to some of the key principles set out in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

Conclusion

6. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised including the appellant's need for additional accommodation for family members, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR