



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by L Gilbert BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/19/3226487

2 Manor Road, Barking IG11 9JA

- 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 Mrs Miah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 18/01506/FUL, dated 30 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. A rear roof dormer, a gable ended roof and conversion of ground floor garage to a study and bedroom, with new windows are shown on the drawings. The Council has confirmed that these were approved through planning permission and a Certificate of Lawfulness. Although these extensions are shown on the drawings, I will only be assessing the proposed two storey side extension under this appeal.
3. Drawing number RE002 is referred to on the decision notice but has not been submitted as part of the appeal. The appellant is also missing this plan and has recommended that it is removed from the appeal documents. The Council has not responded on this matter, therefore I will not be including this drawing in my assessment.

Main Issue

4. The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene and semi-detached pair of houses.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is semi-detached and fronts on to a crossroads at the junction of Manor Road and Westrow Drive. There is a pattern for semi-detached properties to be angled to face into the crossroads. Hedges, shrubs and trees infill the corners by the crossroads. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, characterised by semi-detached and terraced properties.
6. The appeal site contains a semi-detached house which adjoins 18 Westrow Drive. This adjoining property has not been extended at first floor level. The

pair of semi-detached houses are relatively symmetrical. The proposal is for a two-storey extension to replace the existing single storey side element. The extension steps back at first floor with a slight set down from the main roof ridge. Viewed from the front, the proposed extension appears almost the width of the host dwelling. The proposal follows the site boundary and tapers in width to the rear. The proposed extension is set in slightly from the side boundary and has a steep hipped roof which adds to the extension's massing.

7. The lack of subservience of the proposed extension in terms of its width, position close to the side boundary and its steep hipped roof, results in it appearing excessive in terms of scale and massing. The dominant extension fails to complement the pair of semi-detached houses and street scene.
8. The proposed extension would significantly diminish the gap between the site and 4 Manor Road and almost links the property to this neighbouring row of terraces. The semi-detached houses fronting on to the crossroads offer noticeable gaps at the side of the properties, which helps distinguish them as semi-detached. The erosion of the gap between the site and 4 Manor Road, unbalances the pair of semi-detached houses and erodes the pattern of development at the crossroads. It therefore fails to complement or harmonise with the street scene.
9. A number of other properties along Manor Road, Westrow Drive, Melford Avenue and Beccles Drive have been extended with two storey side extensions. The most relevant are the two storey side extensions at 145 Beccles Drive and 19 Westrow Drive, which are located at the same junction as the appeal site. Both of these have a noticeable gap between the extensions and neighbouring properties, which differs to the appeal development.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the street scene and semi-detached pair of houses. It conflicts with policies BP8 and BP11 of the Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011), and the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012). These policies seek, amongst other things, that all development have regard to the local character of the area and help to create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place. It should also protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area.

Other Matters

11. The appellant refers to the development providing an opportunity to render the existing single storey extension with a facelift, to benefit the street scene and create uniformity with other property on the junction of Westrow Drive and 145 Beccles Drive. As highlighted above, there are differences between the proposal and the other two-storey side extensions by the crossroads. I therefore give this limited weight.
12. I note the appellant's comments regarding the processing of the planning application. However, as this does not concern the planning merits it is outside the scope of this appeal.
13. I have had regard to the evidence submitted by the appellant in support of the proposal. Whilst I acknowledge the personal circumstances, these are not

matters which outweigh the harm that would be caused by the proposal as set out above.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Gilbert

INSPECTOR