



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: 1 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/17/3174069
81 Keir Hardy Way, Barking IG11 9NZ

- 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 Brian Torr against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 16/1840/FUL, dated 23 November 2016, was refused by a notice dated 19 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is for a two-storey side extension.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. No 81 is the end house within a terrace of seven two-storey dwellings which are located on short stretch of Keir Hardy Way. The terrace is situated between a three storey development of flats known as Iris Court and a more recent development of three-storey dwellings. There is a distinct gap at both ends of the terrace between the flank wall of the dwellings and their common boundaries with their respective neighbours. Similarly, the flank walls of the neighbouring properties do not abut the common boundary. The gap between these properties provides a relief to the built-up street frontage and ensures that the built form of the individual blocks of development along the street remain visually distinct.
4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Extensions and Alterations, 2012 (SPD) advises that if you live in a house which is an end-of-terrace and you extend to the side, the gap separating your property from your neighbouring may become closed off and have a detrimental effect on the street scene. In the case of this appeal the proposed side extension would abut the property's side boundary and significantly reduce the gap between it and the neighbouring dwelling, No 83. The existing gap contributes positively to the character of the street, and consequently the severe narrowing of this gap as a result of the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

5. I have taken into consideration the concerns raised by the appellant in respect of the scale and location of the neighbouring development. However, it is clear that the siting and design of that development has taken into consideration a need to ensure that the flank wall of No 83 does not abut its common boundary with No 81. The retention of a gap between the two distinct built forms consequently preserves the character and appearance of the street. Furthermore, the relocation of the front door of appeal property, and construction of a front porch would not appear to be dependent on the proposed side extension.
6. I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the development plan, and in particular with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Plan Policies, Development Plan Document, 2011 which together with the Council's SPD, seek to ensure, amongst other things, that the new development, including extensions, has regard to local character.

Conclusion

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

Elizabeth Pleasant

INSPECTOR