

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/16/3162876

78 Keir Hardie Way, Barking, IG11 9NY

- 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 A Cahani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 16/00880/FUL, dated 1 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a front dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a terraced dwelling, which is situated within a residential estate. The dwelling has an asymmetric roof, which results in the property appearing as a bungalow (with low eaves) at the front and as a two storey building at the rear. The terrace, of which it is a part, contains a central section that is two storeys in height. The neighbouring dwellings at numbers 80 and 80a Keir Hardie Way have rooflights on the front-facing roof areas.
4. The proposal is to enlarge the roof space at the front of the property, in order to provide a study. The proposed works would involve the construction of a flat-roofed dormer window. The dormer would be set-in from the side walls of the property and set-back from the eaves.
5. Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Council's adopted Borough Wide Development Policies Plan seek (amongst other things) to ensure that new development is of high quality design and reflects the local character of the area. In my opinion, these policies are consistent with the provisions of paragraph 17 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which has similar requirements. Furthermore, The Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Extensions and Alterations 2012, states that dormer windows should normally be located at the rear of properties and front dormers will, in most

cases, be out of character. I accept that this does not preclude all proposals for front-facing dormer window extensions and that each case should be considered on its merits.

6. I acknowledge that the proposed dormer window would be relatively small in terms of its overall size. It would also match the existing dwelling in terms of its external materials. However, the roofscape of both the dwelling and the terrace is largely unaltered, apart from the rooflights at numbers 80 and 80a. I consider that the existing roofscape is a distinctive and important characteristic of the streetscene.
7. In my opinion, the appeal proposal would appear as an incongruous and disruptive element because of its prominent position on the front of the dwelling. I consider that it would be at odds with the remainder of the terrace and, as such, it would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the streetscene. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the limited public views of the building due to its oblique visual relationship with the main section of Keir Hardie Way. It would, however, be clearly visible from the neighbouring cemetery to the south of the property. In any event, the fact that a proposal may not be highly visible does not, in my opinion, justify development that would cause harm.
8. My attention has also been drawn to other dormer roof extensions and alterations in the vicinity of the appeal site. I viewed these at my site visit. However, I am not persuaded that these developments make a positive visual contribution to the area and, therefore, they should not act as a precedent for the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the proposal would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene. It would conflict with the policies of the Development Plan and with the provisions of the Framework, as referred to above. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR