



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2022

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/22/3301671

30 Atlantis Close, Barking, IG11 0GH

- 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 Trevor Agard the decision of the Council to the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 22/00245/HSE, dated 16 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as the construction of a three storey side extension with four new roof lights, two to the front and two to the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a three storey side extension with four new roof lights, two to the front and two to the rear of the property at 30 Atlantis Close, Barking, IG11 0GH in accordance with the terms of the application, 22/00245, dated 16 February 2022, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing house.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: AC01, AC02, AC03, AC04, AC05, AC06, AC07 & AC08 Rev A.

Preliminary matter

2. The front elevation of the proposed extension, as shown on drawing No. AC08, which was submitted with the appeal application is incorrect. This is because it fails to reflect the proposed set back of the first floor of the proposed extension, shown on the same drawing. The appellant has submitted a revised drawing, No. AC08 Rev A, which corrects this error. As the council has a copy of the revised drawing and refer to the set back of the front building line in their delegated report, I am satisfied that the revised drawing can be accepted without prejudice to any party.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character of the existing dwelling, the pair of dwellings and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated within a modern housing estate that is characterised by detached and semi-detached houses and three/four storey flats developments. Whilst the designs and finishes of the buildings vary, there is a strong sense of uniformity in their layout and overall appearance. Some buildings are symmetrically designed and others mirror adjacent buildings. Broken front building lines and varied ridge heights are extensively used in the design of both terraces and pairs of dwellings. The external materials used in the immediate area include a combination of buff, red and multi colour bricks, render, horizontal timber boarding and plain concrete tiles.
5. Atlantis Close comprises a number of small cul-de-sacs which are all different in their layout and appearance. The cul-de-sac in which the appeal site is located includes some of the older dwellings in the estate and appears less intensively developed than other more recent developments. It is characterised by pairs of symmetrically and asymmetrically designed pairs of semi-detached houses. The appeal dwelling forms one of a pair of symmetrically designed two and a half storey houses which have front porches with gable roofs, white painted horizontal timber cladding at first floor level and steeply pitched roofs with matching dormer windows. To the side they have gable ends and pitched roof single storey wings that are located towards the rear of the dwellings.
6. The pair of dwellings sit on their own within the close, behind front gardens which accommodate on-site parking. To the side of the appeal property is the access to a parking court which serves a three/four storey flats development beyond. To the side of the adjoining house, (No. 32) is a vehicle turning head and row of three garages, with a similarly designed pair of dwellings on the other side of the road.
7. Opposite the appeal property are two pairs of semi-detached houses, one of which is symmetrically designed and the other is asymmetrical. The designs of both pairs of houses are very different to that of the appeal dwelling and No.32. Due to the spacious layout of the cul-de-sac the dwellings and flats developments in adjacent roads can be seen between the existing buildings and at the entrance to the cul-de-sac. Collectively the above features result in a more open, varied and informal character than some of the more recent developments within the estate.
8. Together and amongst other things paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), Policy D4 of the London Plan, Policy CP3 of the Barking & Dagenham Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy 2010 (CS) and Policies BP8 & BP11 of the LDF Borough Wide Development Plan Document (DPD), require new development to be designed to a high quality and to reinforce local distinctiveness. New development should respect and strengthen local character and provide a strong sense of place. It should be suitably designed within the context within which it is set; retain important views and relate appropriately to the surrounding area. It should also optimise the use of the site.

9. The purpose/aim of the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD), is to highlight the different aspects of an extension that the Council will consider when assessing whether a proposal is acceptable. This includes specific design criteria that requires consideration. It advises that extensions should be sympathetic, should not unbalance the original dwelling and should respect the existing roof, fenestration and external materials. Side extensions can upset the symmetry of semi-detached houses and to address this they should appear subordinate to the host dwelling. This should be achieved by setting the first floor of the extension back from the front elevation of the dwelling by at least one metre.
10. In relation to the consideration of the appeal proposal, policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD6 of the London Borough of Barking & Dagenham's Draft Local Plan (Regulation 19 Submission Version, December 2021) (DLP), are consistent with the above policies and advice. Policy DMD6 states that residential extensions should be sympathetic and subordinate to the host dwelling in relation to scale, form, materials and detailing.
11. The proposed two storey extension would sit between the flank wall of the host dwelling and the adjacent parking court, where it would benefit from the spacious setting provided by the parking area. The proposed ground floor would follow the existing front building line and the first floor would be set in slightly from the front building line. Its ridge line would be slightly lower than the that of the main house and its rear elevation would follow the existing rear building lines.
12. The alignment, scale, detailing and materials of the proposed ground and first floor windows would respect and reflect those of the host dwelling. The proposed front roof lights would reflect those on the rear elevation and would align with the top of the existing front dormer. The width of the proposed extension would be in line with the existing single storey side wing and would also reflect the width of the front porch, which stretches across just over half the width of the front elevation.
13. As a result of these factors the proposed extension would appear sympathetic and subordinate to the host dwelling. It would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and symmetry of the pair of dwellings. The proposed extension would similarly respect and reinforce the character and appearance of Atlantic Close and the area, reflecting and reinforcing the use of broken front building lines and varied ridge heights.
14. Although the first floor of the proposed extension would not be recessed by at least one metre, it would comply with the above adopted and emerging policies and would adhere to the aim, purposes and key principles of the SPD. As stated in the SPD, the council is not looking to restrict innovative design and all applications will be judged on their individual merits. The proposal would also optimise the use of the site.
15. Finally, the council has suggested the imposition of conditions relating to the use of matching materials and adherence to the submitted drawings. These conditions are necessary to ensure the proposal respects the host building, the character of the area and in the interests of certainty.
16. I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of dwellings and the area.

Accordingly, the proposal would comply with London Plan Policy D4, CS Policy CP3, DPD Policies BP8 & BP11, the aim of the SPD, DLP Policies SP2, DMD1 & DMD6 and paragraph 130 of the Framework.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR