



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2019

by Conor Rafferty LLB (Hons), AIEMA, Solicitor (Non-practising)

Decision by Chris Preston BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/19/3237730

139 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 Mrs Khatun against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/01062/FUL, dated 6 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and rear infill.
-

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 Issue

3. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located on Hunters Hall Road and comprises an end of terrace property. The surrounding area is characterised by its residential nature, made up of a variety of property styles. However, the appeal site forms part of a row of four dwellings with a high level of similarity in terms of the style and scale of the front elevations of the properties. There is an obvious and pleasing sense of symmetry here due to the centrally placed archway, the arrangement of the front windows and the hipped roof profile of the end properties in the block, characteristics that are shared with the properties in the longer row of terraces immediately opposite and other terraced rows within the wider estate. Consequently, whilst the individual blocks may vary in width the whole estate has a carefully planned and co-ordinated appearance.
5. A gap between the side elevation of the appeal property and the rear boundary of the neighbouring dwelling provides an important visual break in development allowing the symmetrical group of terraced houses to be appreciated in its own right. There is no evidence of any previous extensions to the group from the front elevation and the terraces contribute positively to the character of the residential

area. Similarly, there is little evidence of any substantial alteration to the terraces in the immediate vicinity and the original, cohesively planned, character clearly remains evident.

6. The proposed development relates to a two storey side and first floor rear extension. Whilst matching materials would be used, the scale of the proposal would appear disproportionate to the scale of the existing dwelling and would not respect the current character and proportions of the property.
7. The mass and bulk of the two-storey side and rear extension would be highly visible from Hunters Hall Road where the extensions would have a dominant visual impact which would substantially erode the pleasing symmetry that currently exists in this row of terraced houses. As set out above, that symmetry is a defining feature in the group of properties in the immediate area and the proposal would greatly reduce this sense of coherence. The side extension would represent the first addition of its kind along this row of properties and as a result the high level of symmetry that currently exists at the front elevations of these dwellings would be lost. The proposal would therefore appear as an incongruous feature when viewed from the street.
8. The hipped roof would be replaced with a gable ended roof which would sit lower than the roof height of the appeal property, further distinguishing the proposal from the remainder of the terrace, upsetting the current settlement pattern and failing to have regard to the character and distinctiveness of the immediate area.
9. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, adopted February 2012 (the SPD) recognises that side extensions to end-of-terrace houses may result in the closure of gaps between properties. However, the SPD states that where the gaps between buildings contribute positively to the character of the area it will be expected that the first floor of proposed side extensions are set off the side boundary of the site.
10. As discussed above, the gaps between buildings are an important element in what is clearly a carefully planned estate and the gap between the proposal and the rear boundary of the neighbouring site contributes positively in that respect but also provides a visual break that allows the symmetrical group of terraced houses to be appreciated. As such the proposal is contrary to the guidance laid down in the SPD. The proposal would extend right up to the boundary of the two properties, thereby diminishing the present open character and inhibiting the ability to appreciate the symmetry of the row.
11. I note that the Council has previously granted a certificate of lawful development in relation to a loft conversion that would see the hipped end of the property replaced with a gable end. Confirmation that prior approval was not required for a single storey rear extension has also been given. However, whilst those proposals, if constructed, would result in a loss of symmetry within the row, particularly the removal of the hipped roof, the combined impact would be far less than the substantial and unsympathetic additions proposed in this instance.
12. For all of those reasons, I find that the development would have a significantly adverse visual effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policies BP8 and BP11 of Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document, adopted March 2011 and the SPD.

Other considerations

13. The personal circumstances of the appellant are acknowledged, such that the proposal would meet the needs of the appellant's growing family. It is further acknowledged that no evidence has been provided suggesting there are objections to the proposal by the appellant's neighbours. However, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning considerations and the matters raised in this instance do not attract sufficient weight in planning terms to override the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. Having had regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Preston

INSPECTOR