



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2019 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/19/3234559

85 Westrow Drive, Barking IG11 9BL

- 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 Sandeep Ghataora against the decision of The London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/00950/FUL, dated 31 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling with a rear dormer situated within a dense and mostly residential area. To the rear of the appeal property lies an open area of sports fields associated with the nearby schools. The grain of development is characterised by small blocks of short terraces that are slightly set back from the road. Each terrace is comprised of four properties with long rear gardens. A number of properties along Westrow Drive have single storey rear extensions including the neighbouring property at No. 83 to the south. The neighbouring property at No. 87 does not have any rear extensions however the end-of-terrace property at No. 89, to the north, has a single storey rear extension as well as a narrow two-storey side to rear extension.
 5. The proposal would result in a part two-storey/part single-storey rear extension, the two-storey part of which would abut the boundary with No.83. The first-floor part is proposed to be slightly indented on the northern side in an effort to comply with the Council's 45-degree line of sight rule with neighbouring properties, in this case, No.87. The first-floor extension would have a pitched roof that would project above the existing roof's eaves height.
-

6. The proposed design differs markedly from the existing context. Although the extension would have a pitched roof like the existing house, I find that the proposed introduction of a two-storey rear extension to this mid-terraced house, and the proposed indentation in the first-floor north elevation, would, overall, appear odd and would fail to assimilate properly with the existing rear elevation and roof form. It would constitute poor design, would appear incongruous, and so would visually harm the appearance of the existing dwelling and detract from the character of the area.
7. Although the appellant states that the majority of the proposed pitched roof would have the same eaves height as the main house, the plans indicate that the eaves height of about half of the extension would be higher than those of the host dwelling. The appellant also highlights that there is no policy that clearly states that rear extension eaves should be on the same level or below the eaves of the host dwelling, however extensions should be sympathetically designed with regards to the form and design of the host dwelling. In this case, the extension would fail to respect the form and design of the host dwelling. Consequently, the proposal would also disrupt and unbalance the appearance of the rear terrace block as a whole.
8. I note the appellant's point with regards to what the Council refers to as the angled part of the rear extension. The appellant is concerned the Council has failed to assess the correct plans. However, I have no reason to believe that the Council has failed to assess the correct plans and instead, when referring to the 'angled part of the rear extension', I believe the Council is referring to the first floor northside indent of the proposed extension.
9. I conclude the proposal would harm the established character and appearance of the area. I therefore consider that the proposed development would conflict with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Barking & Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) which together seek to ensure high-quality design of buildings which respect local character.

Recommendation

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

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR