



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2019

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/19/3231773

64 Eastbrook Drive, Rush Green, Romford, RM7 0YX

- 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 Roy Harris against the decision of London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00630/FUL, dated 6 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end terraced house, which is linked to the adjacent semi-detached house (No 66) by a ground floor, flat roof, extension. The surrounding area is composed of short rows of terraced and semi-detached houses. The end of each row, or pair of houses, is clearly defined by a hipped roof and an open gap. Although the gaps between properties are quite small, they are visible and assist in creating a sense of space between the buildings. The cumulative addition of side extensions, particularly at first floor and roof level, would erode this important characteristic of the area.
4. I acknowledge that the proposed first floor side extension has been designed with a hipped roof to reflect the character of the area. I also note that the ridgeline would be set down and the front elevation would be set back set back, giving the extension a subordinate appearance. In many cases such a design would be encouraged. However, in the context of this case, where the extension would fill a planned gap between two distinctly separate buildings, the proposed design would only serve to highlight the fact that the buildings had been merged, rather than constructed as a single terraced block.
5. During my site visit I observed that the rows of houses and the spaces between them are varied and have been altered over time. The appellant considers that joining the row of 4 terraced houses with a pair of semi-detached houses would not appear out of character given the presence of larger rows of terraced properties. However, the larger rows of houses referred to are generally

uniformed, purpose built, terraces that follow a single front and rear building line and have a single roofline (with the exception of some slight step downs in line with the topography of the area). The proposed development would not reflect this as it has been specifically designed to avoid having a terracing effect, by retaining a visual gap at roof level.

6. I have had regard to the examples cited in the appellant's statement of case, of other two storey side extensions that have been constructed in the area. These examples demonstrate the visual harm that would result from the proposal. With the exception of 48 and 50 Valentines Way, the examples highlighted by the appellant are in any event different to the proposal, in that they retain a physical gap between the side elevations of the buildings and not just between the roofs. Moreover, I have not been made aware of the circumstances that led to these other extensions being constructed or how comparable those circumstances are to the case before me. The appellant recognises that the examples provided are not recent.
7. The benefit of the increased living space that would result from the development together with the absence of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers does not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011), which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that the design and layout of new development has regard to local character and amenity.
9. The appellant has referred to the National Planning Policy Framework and to policy 7.6 of the London Plan, both of which also seek to ensure new development is of high quality design that is appropriate to and reinforces local character.
10. The development would also conflict with the advice set out in the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which at paragraph 5.4.2 advises that where gaps between buildings contribute positively to the character of the area, it will be expected that first floor extensions are set off the side boundary of the site. It is also recommended that front elevations are parallel with the front of the existing house in order to maintain the built form of the overall terrace of houses.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR