



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2021

by Megan Thomas Q.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 01 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/21/3276742

16 Manor Road, Barking IG11 9JA

- 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 Yousuf Khan against the decision of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref.21/00449/HSE, dated 11 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is an end-of-terrace, two storey dwellinghouse with a large rear dormer/loft conversion. It is situated on the west side of Manor Road. There is a mixture of off-street and on-street parking and no.16 has an attached single storey garage on its southern side. The housing on Manor Road includes terraces and semi-detached styles. No.18 is to the south of the appeal site and is not part of the terrace of dwellings to which the appeal site belongs. No.18 has a two storey side extension close to the single storey garage which is attached to no.16.
4. Manor Road is short in length but there are a number of gaps at first floor level between the buildings which allow light, longer views and sometimes a view of vegetation to be visible as part of the streetscene. These gaps are a contributing factor to the character of the street making it a more attractive walking and driving environment.
5. The proposed development is for a side extension which would use the footprint of the existing garage at no.16 to create a two storey side extension with a hipped roof.
6. The impact of the development would be to almost close the gap between no.18 Manor Road and no.16, so that there would be no meaningful view

between or beyond the buildings. In this case I consider that would be unduly harmful to the character of the street particularly as no.16 is the end of a terrace of dwellings and the loss of the gap would mean losing the clearly-defined end of the terrace. For this reason, I do not agree with the appellant that the loss of the gap would not materially alter the openness of Manor Road.

7. I consider that, in line with the Council's *Residential Extensions and Alterations* Supplementary Planning Document 'SPD' (2012), architectural gaps can contribute positively to the appearance of residential units from within the streetscene, and side extensions have the potential to cause significant impact upon the character of the area especially when visible from the public realm and when the blocks and terraces of residential units have clearly defined gaps. Those factors are present here and I have concluded that the loss caused by the proposal would cause significant harm.
8. I do not agree with the appellant that there is any tangible benefit gained from no.16 having a two storey side extension which would then add balance to the streetscene as no.18 has a two storey side extension. No.16 is part of a terrace and no.18 is visually paired with no.20 Manor Road and so any benefit is, to my mind, of very limited weight.
9. Turning to the proposed design of the side extension, the roof of the main house has been made into a gable end as part of the loft conversion and the proposed hipped roof of the extension would meet the side wall of the gable end. This would not reflect the look of the main house as it now presents, and is not a suggested two storey side extension solution favoured in the SPD. It would appear awkward and disjointed and would harm the character of the host dwelling. I acknowledge that a gable wall frontage extension was part of a previously unsuccessful scheme but that does not alter the fact that the scheme before me is not an acceptable design solution.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene. It would be in conflict with policy D8 of The London Plan (March 2021), policy CP3 of the Borough's Core Strategy (July 2010), policy BP11 of the Borough Wide Development Policies DPD (March 2011) and the SPD.

Conclusion

11. Having taken into account all representations made, and for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas Q.C.

INSPECTOR