



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020

by M Heron BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/19/3228219

12 Jackson Road, Barking IG11 7UE

- 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 Sem Rada against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 19/00103/FUL, dated 18 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey part single storey rear extension and conservatory (resubmission).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupants of Nos 10 and 14 Jackson Road, with particular regard to outlook and access to daylight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. Jackson Road is a residential street which does not lie within a conservation area or comprise any listed buildings. It is characterised by rows of two-storey, terraced, dwellings constructed under gambrel roofs which incorporate dormer windows to front and rear. Most of these gambrel roofs remain unaltered. The common architectural design of properties in this street gives them a strong sense of rhythm and uniformity. No 12 is a mid-terraced dwelling positioned on the western side of the carriageway. Its overall design, including its undeveloped gambrel roof, harmonises with surrounding built form.
4. This proposal seeks permission to construct a part two-storey/part single-storey rear extension. The proposed single-storey element would be a full width extension constructed under a flat roof. In my view, its bulk and scale would not unduly dominate the design of the host property. This element of the scheme would therefore be acceptable in a visual sense.

5. Nevertheless, the proposed two storey extension would add a considerable amount of bulk and mass to the gambrel roof of No 12. Not only would this erode the simple roofscape of this property, but such a feature would also appear out of character with the prevailing roofscape within the immediate area. In addition, this extension would be notably wider than adjacent dormer windows and its rear window would be larger than existing first floor fenestration. This would draw the eye to its incongruity, exacerbating its harmful impact to the design of No 12.
6. I appreciate that the two-storey extension would be constructed under a gambrel roof. However, taking the above into account, I find that it would be a bulky and out of proportion addition to the host property that would fail to integrate effectively with the rhythm and uniformity of surrounding properties. Its harmful appearance would be readily apparent from the rear gardens of several nearby properties. This harm would not be sufficiently diminished through the use of appropriate materials.
7. I note that there are examples of similar developments to that proposed in the immediate area. However, in the absence of details about when or how they were assessed, they carry little weight in my assessment of the appeal scheme, which I have performed based on its individual planning merits.
8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) and the provisions of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that developments have regard to local character and protect and enhance the character of areas.

Living Conditions

9. From the evidence, the proposed first floor extension would breach a 45 degree sight line by approximately one metre when taken from the nearest corner of both Nos 10 and 14. This is contrary to the guidance within the SPD. However, this extension would be stepped away considerably from shared neighbouring boundaries and its gambrel roof would reduce its perceived bulk when viewed from the side. Taking this into account, I am not persuaded that the scale and positioning of the first floor extension would appear as a visually dominant or oppressive feature when viewed from the rear of adjoining properties. The identified conflict with the SPD would therefore not result in any material planning harm.
10. Turning to the proposed single storey extension, although not insignificant in depth, it would only have a maximum height of approximately three metres. In addition, sections of obscure glazing towards the end of the side elevations of this extension would reduce its perceived bulk and mass. Consequently, on balance, I find that the scale and positioning of the single storey extension would not appear as a visually dominant feature when viewed from within Nos 10 or 14 and their rear gardens.
11. Taking all of the above into account, even when considered cumulatively, I conclude that the proposed extensions would not significantly harm the living conditions of the occupants of Nos 10 and 14 in terms of outlook. In addition,

given the orientation of these properties on their plots, I am not persuaded that the scheme would significantly diminish the access to daylight at these properties. Accordingly, the proposal would accord with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the DPD insofar as they seek to ensure that developments maintain residential amenity in terms of outlook and access to daylight and sunlight.

Other Considerations

12. With regard to the positioning of fenestration within the proposal and its distance to properties beyond the rear of the appeal site, the scheme would not harm living conditions at surrounding dwellings in terms of privacy. However, this is a requirement of the development plan and is therefore not a reason to set aside the harm identified.
13. I appreciate that this scheme would provide improved accommodation for the existing occupants. However, this is not a reason to permit a scheme which would conflict with the Council's development plan in the manner identified above.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the advice of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweigh this conflict. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Heron

INSPECTOR