



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31/12/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/20/3251417

39 Greatfields Road, Barking, IG11 7UA

- 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 Naheem against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/00185/FUL, dated 13 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 39 Greatfields Road, Barking, IG11 7UA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00185/FUL, dated 13 February 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TFK 0601/01; TFK 0601/02; TFK 0601/03; TFK 0601/04; and TFK 0601/05.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows / dormer windows shall be constructed on the side elevations of the extension.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider terrace.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a mid terrace dwelling which is located in a row comprising four properties. The design of the terrace incorporates a distinctive mansard style roof. The surrounding area comprises rows of terraced dwellings of a similar design and appearance.

4. The appeal proposal is a first floor rear extension which would be constructed above an existing single storey rear extension. The proposed extension would be set in from both of the side boundaries with the neighbouring dwellings.
5. The proposed rear extension would have a depth of 3 metres and would be set down from the ridge of the existing dwelling. As such it would appear a subservient addition to the dwelling. The extension would incorporate a pitched roof to match the existing dwelling and it would have a tile finish to match the existing roof. I also note that the window proposed on the extension would align with other windows on the rear elevation. I therefore find that the proposed extension would integrate and harmonise sufficiently with the host dwelling such that it would not be harmful to its character or appearance. The proposed extension would not conflict with the design guidance set out in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012) which states that the design of rear extensions should be sympathetic towards the original dwellinghouse. Whilst the SPD is for guidance purposes only, it does nonetheless provide useful advice.
6. I noted at my site visit that the other dwellings within the same terrace have not been extended to the rear at first floor level. However, I have found that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and I am also satisfied that it would not materially harm the character or appearance of the wider terrace. Moreover, on my site visit I noted several examples of rear extensions on dwellings within adjacent and nearby terraces, where similar additions at first floor level have been constructed.
7. In conclusion, the proposal extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or the wider terrace. I find that it would comply with Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011) which together require development to be of a high quality design and to respect existing character.

Other matters

8. With regard to other issues raised, the proposed extension would be set in from the side boundaries of the site and given its depth of 3 metres I am satisfied that it would not lead to a significant loss of outlook or overshadowing of adjoining dwellings.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard 3 years implementation condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the extension to be constructed in matching materials to ensure a satisfactory external appearance. A condition ensuring that no windows are added to the side elevations of the extension is required in order to protect the privacy of occupiers of the adjacent properties. The approved plans condition is imposed for clarity.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR