

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2021

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/20/3260645

40 Westrow Drive, Barking, IG11 9BJ

- 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 Ismail Ahmet against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/01209/HSE, dated 13 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 40 Westrow Drive, Barking, IG11 9BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01209/HSE, dated 13 June 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: GLA-01L, GLA-02L, GLA-03L, GLA-04L, GLA-05L.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the adjoining terrace and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey, traditional, end of terrace house with an existing loft conversion with roof windows to the front elevation. The terrace comprises four dwellings each with a two storey front bay. The two end of terrace dwellings have feature oriel windows, protruding from the main facade above the front doors. Together the terrace displays rhythm and symmetry.
-

4. The street is characterised by similar terraces together with some semi-detached pairs and detached houses. Overall there is a consistency of layout and design which unifies the street. It is understood that Westrow Drive forms part of the Leftley Estate which was built during the 1930s and whilst not designated is considered to be locally distinctive and historically important by the Council.
5. The proposed side extension would be above an existing single, flat roofed garage. It would be set back from the main façade by about 1m and set in from the shared boundary to a similar extent. It would have a gable end to match the existing dwelling but the ridge would be set down. A pitched roof would sit above the existing front section of the garage, linking to the extension. This would echo the pitched roof above the existing porch.
6. A significant number of other similar dwellings in Westrow Drive have already been extended to the side. In many cases the extension occupies the full width of the garage. Some are set back from the main façade or otherwise appear subservient to the host dwelling, others are flush. These existing extensions are sufficiently numerous that they form part of the character and appearance of the street and where carefully designed they assimilate well into the street scene.
7. The Council refers to guidance in its Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), "Residential Extensions and Alterations", 2012 which suggests that side extensions to terraced dwellings should be designed to be parallel with the front elevation of the host dwelling. However, it is clear that in this case where the terrace is short and displays symmetry and rhythm associated with two storey bays that the SPD advice relating to semi-detached dwellings is equally applicable. This refers to the need for a side extension to be set back from the main façade in order to be subordinate and maintain symmetry and balance.
8. The proposed extension at the appeal dwelling has been designed to be subservient to the main dwelling. The set-back from the main façade would ensure that it did not disrupt the architectural character of the terrace and this, together with the retained gap to the side boundary would prevent a terracing effect and maintain a gap at first floor. Overall the extension would be a modest and well designed addition that would be sympathetic to the host dwelling, the terrace, the street scene and the Leftley Estate.
9. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed extension would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling, terrace or surrounding area. In consequence, there would be no conflict with Policy CP3 of the Council's Core Strategy, 2010, or Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document, 2011, or emerging draft policies which have similar objectives. Taken together these expect new development to achieve high quality standards in relation to design and layout such that it protects or enhances the character and amenity of the area having regard to local identity, distinctiveness and place. For the reasons set out above, I consider there would also be compliance with the underlying objectives of the SPD.
10. In addition to the statutory commencement condition, the Council suggests conditions to ensure that the extension is built in accordance with the approved

plans and using external materials that match the existing building. I agree that these are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in order to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace and the surrounding area.

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

KE Down
INSPECTOR