
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2017

by Elizabeth Pleasant DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3174820
113 Hunters Hall Road, Dagenham RM10 8LH

- 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 Nicolae Vasile against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 16/01962/FUL, dated 13 December 2016, was refused by a notice dated 1 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor single storey infill extension and first floor side extension with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of the Becontree Estate which, by reason of its original development to provide 'Homes for Heroes', is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The estate has a distinct character derived from its homogenous appearance.
4. The appeal site forms the end of a terrace of ten properties which display simple original design characteristics which provide the street with a strong uniformity in appearance. These characteristics include their modest scale, proportions and simple hipped roofs. Although the individual terraces vary in their length, overall they have a distinct symmetry and the gaps between the ends of terraces provide a visual relief and rhythm to the street scene.
5. I noted on my visit that the host property has carried out a roof alteration and extension by the converting the original hipped roof to a gable and constructing a substantial rear dormer. A single storey side extension has also been partially constructed. The alterations to the roof have significantly diminished the original character of the dwelling and the loss of the hipped roof has disrupted the symmetry and appearance of the terrace as a whole.
6. The proposed first floor side extension would introduce further modifications to the roof form, including a step in the ridge and a catslide roof incorporating

a further rear dormer window. I accept that the proposed alterations would appear subservient to the existing gabled roof form, however, overall the property's rear roof scape would not be cohesive. The differing roof forms and additions would appear visually incongruous and detract from the original simple form and character of the terrace as a whole. Furthermore, although the catslide roof and rear dormer would not be visible from Hunters Hall Road, they would be clearly visible to the private views of neighbouring residents, and to public views from Alibon Road, where the rear of No 113 is clearly visible through the gaps between properties. The proposed roof of the extension and dormer window would therefore have a harmful impact on the character of both the host property and on the appearance of the surrounding area.

7. The existing side extension has reduced the gap between 113 and the neighbouring terrace. However, as it is only single storey in height there remains a clear visual break between these neighbouring terraces at first floor level. The proposed first floor extension, with its extended gable roof, would further diminish this gap and detract from the spatial characteristics of the street. Furthermore, I concur with the views expressed by my colleagues,¹ that should this appeal succeed, it would make it more difficult for the Council to resist further planning applications for similar developments, particularly to the neighbouring terrace, which cumulatively would exacerbate the harm I have identified above. Although the width of the proposed extension has been marginally reduced since the previous appeals, I am not persuaded that its impact would be significantly less harmful.
8. I conclude that the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies CP2 of Barking & Dagenham's Core Strategy, 2010 and Policies BP2, BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Plan Policies, Development Plan Document, 2011, which together with the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012), seek to ensure, amongst other criteria, that new development has regard to local character, its historic environment and contributes to local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Pleasant

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Z5060/D/15/3111223 & APP/Z5060/D/16/3154769