



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2021

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/20/3263769

109 Valentines Way, Rush Green, Romford RM7 0YD

- 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 Dean White against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/01857/HSE, dated 18 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 109 Valentines Way, Rush Green, Romford RM7 0YD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01857/HSE, dated 18 September 2020, and the plans submitted with it, 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: Block plan of the site - Dated 23.01.2020; Site & other plans - Dated 23.01.2020; Existing and Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans and Existing and Proposed Front, Rear and Side Elevation - DRG/001/050920 to DRG/004/050920 - Dated 05.09.2020.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. In March 2021, after the main parties had submitted their statements, the Major published The London Plan 2021. It comprises the spatial development strategy for London and forms part of the development plan. The London Plan replaces all earlier versions. Policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan, which relate to delivery of good design and public realm, are similar to their predecessors, policies 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6. As these policies have not significantly altered through the plan making process, I have proceeded to determine the appeal on the submitted evidence.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey end of terrace house set behind a small driveway. The terrace comprises five dwellings each with a two-storey front bay. Together the terrace has some uniformity, in terms of pattern and form, but the dwellings differ in appearance notably because each has a different window style and the end houses have front porch extensions. Valentines Way is characterised by similar short terraces with only small gaps between. The front elevation of many of the dwellings has been altered and I found no overall cohesion to the appearance of the street scene.
5. The *Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document* (2012) (SPD) suggests that side extensions to terrace houses should be parallel with the front extension. Consistent with this, the proposed two-storey side extension would align with the main façade of the appeal dwelling, behind the existing two-storey bay and porch. The extension would have a gable end and ridge height to match the existing, sympathetic to the host dwelling and the wider terrace.
6. The extension would extend only around 1.2m to the side, filling the gap between the existing flank elevation and the back edge of the pavement as it returns the corner of Great Cullings. The appeal dwelling has an existing full width single storey kitchen extension to the rear which already meets the back edge of the pavement. The proposed extension would be around 6.8m in depth and would meet this single storey extension to the rear, replacing the existing low side boundary wall.
7. The SPD advises that, by extending an end of terrace house, the gaps separating the house with its neighbours may become closed to the detriment of the street scene. I saw from my site visit that the small gaps between the short rows of terraces on Valentines Way have been largely retained. However, the appeal dwelling is located on the corner of Great Cullings and therefore extending to the side boundary would not cause harm to this pattern of development. Further, the extension is very modest in scale and would largely retain the open appearance of Valentines Way as it turns the corner to Great Culling. I therefore find no conflict with the SPD guidance.
8. Other similar dwellings in the area have already been extended to the side up to the boundary. On the other side of Great Cullings, No.115 Valentines Way has a single storey extension which extends part way along the flank elevation. No.115 Eastbrook Drive (No.115) which is diagonally opposite the appeal dwelling has been extended to the side over two-storeys up to the side boundary. No.115 forms part of a similar terrace of five houses and whilst benefitting from a larger plot than the appeal dwelling it nonetheless forms part of the existing character and appearance of the area.
9. In conclusion, the extension would be a well-designed addition, sympathetic to the terrace and would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan (March 2021) (LP), Policy CP3 of the Council's Core Strategy (2010) (CS)

or Policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) (DPD), or emerging draft policies which have similar objectives. Taken together these require new development to achieve high standards in relation to design and layout such that it protects or enhances the character and amenity of the area, respecting local character.

10. Further, there would be no conflict with LP Policy D8 which, amongst other things, requires development to ensure a mutually supportive relationship between the space, surrounding buildings and their uses. Finally, because it is sympathetic to local character the proposed extension would not conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
11. CS Policy CP2 and DPD Policy BP2 relate to the protection of the historic environment. As the appeal dwelling is not identified as a heritage asset, these policies are not relevant to the case before me and have been afforded no weight in my consideration.

Conditions

12. 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 to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR