

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/16/3159451

51 Melford Avenue, Barking IG11 9HS

- 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 Harpreet Kaur against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 16/00711/FUL, dated 4 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as a double storey side extension.
-

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 street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey end of terrace house with a hipped roof and an attached single garage to the side. It is located in a residential street comprising short terraces of similar age and design. Whilst some end of terrace houses have been extended to the side at first floor level, in general the gaps between terraces remain. This absence of development between terraces at first floor level is a key feature of the street scene and therefore a matter to which I attach significant weight.
 4. The proposal would extend the property to the side boundary at first floor level and the hipped roof would be expanded with the formation of a side-facing gable. The important gap between the neighbouring terraces would be significantly reduced and, due to the slight bend in the road, the first floor side addition and gable above would be prominent and incongruous elements in the street scene.
 5. I conclude therefore that, as a consequence of its siting, height and size the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. It therefore conflicts with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) (BWDP) which, amongst other matters, expects 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).

6. I note that planning permission was granted in 2011 for the infilling of the gap between 26 and 28 Melford Avenue. The scheme included the side extension to both properties and the Council's records indicate that at the time one of the properties benefitted from an extant consent granted before the adoption of the BWDP. The appeal proposal is not directly comparable to the 2011 permission and therefore I attribute limited weight to it.
7. Whilst each application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits, I am conscious that in these particularly circumstances allowing the appeal would lead to further pressure for similar development, which in my judgement would harm to the appearance of the area. I attach significant weight to this.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR