



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3273695

24 Bennett Road, Chadwell Heath, Romford, RM6 6ER

- 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 Tahira Azim against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 21/00268/HSE, dated 12 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'first floor rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policy CP2 in the Council's Core Strategy (2010) (CS) and BP2 and BP11 in its Borough Wide Development Plan Policies DPD (2011). It also includes policies D1 and D4 in the Published London Plan 2021 (LP). Together these seek to ensure that development delivers high-quality design that respects the local context. I agree with the appellant that the 45° line referred to in the Council's SPD guidance is not relevant to this case as it seeks to ensure acceptable residential amenity and the Council has not objected in regards to that matter.
3. The appeal site comprises a traditional end of terrace dwelling in a corner position. Although there is a hipped roof house on the opposite corner, the surrounding area is characterised predominantly by long terraces with pitched roofs and gabled ends.
4. The appeal property has previously been extended to the rear, side and front elevations with a wrap-around single storey extension (permitted by the Council some years ago) and has a loft conversion with a large rear dormer allowed under permitted development. Those extensions have significantly increased the bulk and massing of the dwelling and have resulted in a variety of roof forms. A previous application for a similar scheme to the current proposal but with a part gable/part hipped roof was refused by the Council (20/01944/HSE) by reason of its scale, massing and roof design.
5. The current scheme differs in that it has a hipped roof design. It would be built above the existing ground floor extension and would have a significantly lower ridge height than the main roof. Whilst I agree with the appellant that the

existing flat roof, side elevation and dormer window detract from the appearance of the dwelling and that a first floor extension would create some balance, the proposed roof form is not appropriate.

6. Although it would reduce the scale and massing of the extension to some extent, it would introduce yet another roof form to the property which would be at odds with the predominant pitched roofs and gabled ends of most other end terrace dwellings in the area. Given its prominent corner position, the proposed extension would be clearly seen from both Bennett Road and from Merten Road. As such, it would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of both the dwelling and the area.
7. I have not been told of the circumstances and planning context of the other extensions in the area referred to by the appellant but, in any case, those examples are not typical of most of the corner properties in this area and therefore I am not persuaded that they set a precedent for this proposal.
8. I have noted that the appellant seeks to provide additional accommodation for a family home and that the National Planning Policy Framework seeks to make the best use of urban land but that does not outweigh the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area in this case.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan policies referred to earlier and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal is dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector