

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2017

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/16/3162552
16 Wykeham Green, Dagenham, RM9 4NL

- 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 Abdul Alim against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 16/00985/FUL dated 24 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is '*Erect single storey rear extension.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - 1) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - 2) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of surrounding occupiers, with particular regard to the outlook of the residents at No 17 Wykeham Green.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal dwelling like No 17, its semi-detached neighbour, has already been extended with a flat-roofed, brick-built, single-storey addition to a depth of approximately 3.6m, as mentioned in the appellant's statement. No 17's extension is to a slightly greater depth, and there is narrow gap between the two additions.
 4. The proposal at appeal seeks to extend the dwelling by an additional 4m which, as depicted on the submitted drawing no 04, would result in a substantial expanse of flat roof projecting out from the original rear wall of the dwelling. Arising from this, the cumulative depth of some 7.6m from this point would involve a the creation of an extension of excessive depth which, from my viewpoint in the property's rear garden, would appear to be significantly out of character with that of the surrounding area. The resultant area of flat roof
-

stretching out from the main dwelling would compound this incongruity and, as such, I consider that the proposed extension's design and scale would be an inappropriate form of development in this particular setting.

5. On the first main issue I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to the aims and requirements of Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Council's Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) which, amongst other things, require that all developments, including extensions, should have regard to, and protect, local character.

Living conditions

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' (SPD) advises that, in order to ensure that there is no material loss of outlook or daylight to semi-detached properties, the depth of an extension should not normally exceed a projection of 3.65m from the original rear wall. Although No 17 has already been extended, and is slightly deeper than the appeal dwelling's addition I consider that the proposed additional depth would be of such significance so as to impact on the neighbouring occupiers.
7. Although I noted that No 17 sits directly south of the appeal property and that a prominent bush is situated within its rear garden close to the common boundary the additional 4m would somewhat counteract the favourable orientation, whilst there is no guarantee that the high bush would remain in situ. Indeed, it appeared to me that its presence likely already affects light entry into No 17's rear window. In such circumstances I am also mindful that the SPD mentions that the common 45 degree angle test – a general rule of thumb in weighing up whether or not a neighbouring extension's depth would create an undue effect – should be employed. The appellant has not demonstrated that No 17's rear window would not be adversely affected in this regard and, in weighing up the various factors, I consider that as a result of the extension's proposed depth the rear outlook from No 17 would suffer as a consequence.
8. On the second main issue I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of surrounding occupiers, contrary to the aims and requirements of DPD Policies BP8 and BP11 which, amongst other things, serve to guard against the loss of local amenities. Further, the SPD guidance would also be contravened.

Conclusion

9. I have found harm on both main issues which is compelling. Neither the intended absence of side windows in the extension nor the use of external materials in its construction to match the host dwelling would mitigate in this regard. The appeal, therefore, does not succeed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR