



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2020

by Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09/12/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/20/3250606

17 Lancaster Avenue, Barking, IG11 7RB

- 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 Ms Hazera Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/00132/FUL, dated 4 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'First Floor Side and Rear Extension + Loft Conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of the development set out in the banner heading above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details before me that the development comprises a first floor side and rear extension, and a loft conversion involving the construction of a rear dormer window and hip to gable roof alteration. The Council have dealt with it on this basis and so shall I.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and terrace row, and on the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a two-storey hipped roof end terrace house that is situated in a prominent corner location next to the junction of Lancaster Avenue and Coniston Avenue. The character of the immediate area is residential, comprising similar terrace rows with predominantly hipped roofs. There is a general uniformity in the design and layout of these properties, which provide simple, and balanced buildings.
5. The Council has not raised any objections to the proposed rear dormer. However, the construction of this would require a change in the original dwelling's roof form from a hipped to a ridge and gable design. This alteration, in combination with the uncharacteristic flat roof design of the proposed first floor side and rear extension would not only have an unsympathetic relationship with the appeal building but would provide significant additional

visual bulk and dominance to it. It would also appear unbalanced and jarring, particularly when seen in the context of the hipped roof forms of adjacent neighbouring properties and the short terrace row that it adjoins. Due to the appeal site's corner position the discordant nature of the proposal would be plainly visible from Lancaster Avenue, Coniston Avenue and the windows of neighbouring properties.

6. My attention has been drawn to examples of other two storey side extensions on corner plots in the surrounding area, and these are shown in a number of photographs that the appellant has submitted. However, none of the examples include hip to gable roof alterations or flat roof first floor side and rear extensions. Accordingly, the circumstances in these cases are not directly comparable to those which apply in the appeal. I have, in any case, determined the appeal on its own merits.
7. I therefore find that the development proposed would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the terrace row, and on the street scene. As such it would conflict with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) as well as advice contained within the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012). Taken together, these seek, amongst other things, sensitive design that responds to local character.

Other matters

8. The appellant has also put forward that the proposal would be traditional in appearance and provide additional and enhanced living space and improved living conditions for her growing family. She has stated that it would maintain modern standards of insulation and energy saving, by having rooms that are spaced out, with natural ventilation and are well-lit by daylight. However, these factors do not overcome the harm that I have identified above.
9. I also note that the Council's planning officer report raises an objection in respect of the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of 'No 19'. However, this was not included in the decision notice as a reason for refusal and the assessment in the planning officer report appears to be based on 18 Lancaster Avenue and 2 Coniston Avenue. Nonetheless, given my findings on the effect of the proposal on character and appearance, and on the street scene, it has not been necessary for me to reach a conclusion on this matter.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Mark Caine

INSPECTOR