



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2019 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by P J Davies BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/19/3234763
221 Westrow Drive, Barking IG11 9BS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ibrahim Hanif Bukhari against the decision of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/00817/FUL dated 9 May 2019 was refused by notice dated 5 July 2019.
 - The proposed development is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Ibrahim Hanif Bukhari against the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Appeal Procedure

3. 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

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a two-storey end of terrace property located on the western side of Westrow Drive. It is situated in an established residential area that is predominantly comprised of small terraces. The appeal site, and most of the end terrace properties along this side of Westrow Drive, have a mixture of single storey and two storey side extensions with various sized gaps, or in some instances, no gaps, between the terraces. However, the terrace the appeal site is part of contains modest single storey side extensions at each end which adjoin respective neighbouring side extensions of similar scale. As such, there is a comparable sized gap at each end at first floor level which is significant compared to other gaps on this side of Westrow Drive. This provides a sense of openness and visual relief to the built-up area. Furthermore, the modest scale and similarities of built form on either side of this terrace at

ground floor level create a distinct sense of balance and uniformity in an otherwise varied built up area.

6. Although the proposal would be set below the existing ridge line, on its own, this would allow it to be read as a visually subservient extension to the house. Similarly, the lower eaves level at the rear would be marginal and not prominent. I consider therefore that these aspects of the design are acceptable. However, notwithstanding that it would be constructed with matching materials, the proposal would appear as a significantly sized side extension in comparison to the subservient nature of the side extensions present within the terrace it is part of, and its immediate vicinity. This would harmfully disrupt the existing sense of balance and uniformity. The proposal would also reduce the wide gap it shares with No. 223 at first floor level, which combined with its scale, would result in a close relationship between the terraces, reducing openness and failing to respect the established pattern and character of the immediate vicinity. In relation to the terrace as a whole and in this part of the street scene, it would therefore appear as a bulky and incongruous addition.
7. Although the development would provide an opportunity to improve the render of the single storey side extension to benefit the street scene, I do not consider the existing side extension to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The development therefore provides no material benefit in this respect.
8. The appellant draws attention to other two storey side extensions, including No.104. However, these properties are on another section of Westrow Drive and are a significant distance away. As such, there is a difference in the context associated to these properties which are not comparable to the appeal site. The appellant also refers to No.191 which does not appear to have a two-storey side extension, albeit I observed an extension at No.189 which has not directly influenced the individual context of the appeal proposal where the visual gaps between the terraces make a positive contribution to the street scene. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) which seeks to protect or enhance the local character. This is further echoed in the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted February 2012.

Other Matters

10. I note the lack of neighbour objections and that there would be no impact on living conditions for neighbouring occupiers. However, these are neutral factors that would not outweigh the identified harm.

Recommendation and Conclusion

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

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

P J Davies

INSPECTOR