

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2021

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/20/3251746

453 Ripple Road, Barking, London IG11 9QZ

- 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 Bilal Ahmad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 20/00091/FUL, dated 22 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side & ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect on the living conditions of the residents of 455 Ripple Road with regard to daylight and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The property is an end terrace on a corner plot. It has a prominent front facing two storey gable. The side boundary with the neighbouring property on Stuart Road, which is also an end terrace, runs at an angle between these two corner houses. The extension would be set a metre from the side boundary and has been designed to follow its alignment. The front elevation of the extension would be of the same form as the distinctive front gable of the property but set well back from the front building line. Although this would result in the gable being less prominent, the uniform appearance of the frontage, as shown in the elevation drawing, would differ in reality, given that the new gable would not extend beyond the secondary frontage. As it would be of the same height as the existing gable, it would actually appear as an extremely dominant feature within the remaining roof slope.
 4. The side elevation would be clearly evident within the street scene and as it would have only a very limited depth before tapering to the rear, it would have an uncharacteristic appearance. This element in particular, would appear contrived and cramped within the plot. It would also be a dominant and
-

unattractive feature, given its convoluted roof form, particularly when viewed from the side garden of the neighbouring property.

5. Overall, when viewed from the east, the proposal would have an unsatisfactory design that would detract from the character and appearance of the area. The scale of the proposed front facing gable would, despite being of a matching form, detract from the distinctive appearance of the existing gable. The side extension would be too large for this small plot and would result in harm to the appearance of this terrace; and the setting of the neighbouring terrace in Stuart Road. It would therefore be contrary to the design requirements of policies BP8 and BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011 (DP). As these are consistent with the design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, I afford them full weight. The Council's Residential Extension and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) requires that care is taken when dealing with corner plot development. The proposal does not satisfy this requirement.
6. The Council do not refer to the London Plan in their reason for refusal. The revised London Plan was adopted in March 2021 during the process of this appeal. I am satisfied that the design policies of the new plan are consistent with the aspirations of the Council's policies in this regard and do not offer support for this proposal.

Living conditions of neighbouring residents

7. The Council's concerns relate to the impact of the single storey rear extension on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents in the attached property at 455 Ripple Road. The extension would be 4 metres deep and set marginally in from the boundary. It would have a flat roof with a side parapet wall extending to just over 3 metres in height. It would replace the small existing extension and garden sheds on the boundary. The adjoining property has a rear conservatory which is set away from the boundary. Whilst it has side windows that face the proposed extension, its main aspect is to the rear.
8. The rooms to the rear of these properties are north facing. Given this aspect and the position of properties in Stuart Terrace, there is limited potential for the rear windows to benefit from direct sunlight and this proposal would not alter this. Given the height of this proposal and the position and nature of the neighbouring conservatory, the extension would not significantly reduce light levels within the conservatory and any reduction would not be unacceptably harmful. Given its height, which is higher than necessary given the parapet wall to the side, the proposal would reduce the outlook for the neighbouring residents when in their rear conservatory and their garden beyond it. As this impact could be reduced by an alternative design with lower eaves, this element represents poor design in this particular context.
9. The Council's SDP seeks to limit rear extensions to a depth of 3.65 metres and a height of 3 metres to protect outlook and light. It accepts deeper extensions where a 45 degree line from the corner of the adjacent house is not breached. This proposal would be deeper than the maximum figure and marginally higher. It would not satisfy the 45 degree rule. There is therefore conflict with the SPD requirements. As the proposal would result in more harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring residents than is necessary for a building of this

depth, it would also conflict with the amenity requirements of DP policies BP8 and BP11 with regard to outlook and amenity.

Conclusions

10. The two storey side extension would not be of a satisfactory design or form and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The single storey rear extension represents poor design given the unnecessary impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents with regard to outlook. There are no considerations that outweigh these concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR