
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2017

by Elaine Gray MA(Hons) MSc IHBC

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

Decision date: 26 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3166668
83 Meadow Road, Barking IG11 9QP

- 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 Micheal Hegarty against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 16/01510/FUL, dated 24 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side and rear extension.
-

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 surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site at 83 Meadow Road is located within a predominantly residential area. It forms one of a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellings which are located in a prominent position facing the junction between Meadow Road and Merton Road. The development would result in the construction of a two storey side and rear extension to No 83.
 4. The Council's document entitled 'Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document' (SPD, February 2012) sets out guidelines for extensions to residential properties. It states that, in the case of semi-detached houses, the gap with the neighbouring property can contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area. Side extensions should therefore be set off from the side boundary of the site.
 5. The character of the area is informed by the distinctive layout whereby longer runs of terraces are interspersed by pairs of semi-detached dwellings which occupy corner plots, and are set at an angle to the neighbouring terraces. The gaps between the groups of dwellings are an important element of the layout of the area. In particular, the corner plots tend to be more generous, adding to the spacious, suburban quality of the surroundings.
 6. In this case, a separation distance of only around 0.1m would remain between the new extension and the north-west site boundary of the garden, nearest to the neighbouring 81 Meadow Road. By largely infilling the plot, the
-

- development would appear bulky and cramped within the site, and would substantially reduce the existing openness at the side of No 83.
7. The SPD also states that extensions should be subordinate to the existing building, and should be set in by 1m at first floor level. Whilst the roof line of the development would be set down by a small distance from the existing roof height, the front elevation would be set in by only 0.5m. The extension would thus fall short of the SPD recommendation, and would fail to achieve a sufficient degree of visual subordination to No 83. Furthermore, it would disrupt the established building line which runs along the front elevations of 71-81 Meadow Road and meets the west corner of No 83. As a result, it would appear overly prominent in relation to the adjoining terrace.
 8. Drawing these factors together, I find that the proposed development would be unacceptably harmful to the street scene, and would fail to maintain the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy BP8 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD, March 2011), insofar as it requires all development to have regard to the local character of the area, and DPD Policy BP11, which amongst other things seeks to protect the character and amenity of the area. It would also be at odds with the guidelines set out in the SPD.
 9. I accept that the design of the new extension would be in keeping with that of No 83, and that the roof form of the proposed extension would reflect that of the existing roof. The proposed materials of bricks or blocks, as described on the application form, would differ, but this could be controlled by way of a suitably worded condition, were the scheme to be found otherwise acceptable. I acknowledge that the extension would provide much needed living space for the occupants of No 83, but this would amount to a private benefit. None of these matters would outweigh the harm I have identified. Whilst No 83 is not listed, and is not located within a conservation area, the proposal must still be considered against the relevant development plan policies, which clearly apply to all new development.
 10. For those reasons, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Gray

INSPECTOR