



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/22/3308036

28 Wanderer Drive, Barking and Dagenham, Barking IG11 0XJ

- 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 Alejandro Estrada Gamboa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 22/01149/HSE, dated 1 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council has referenced policies of the emerging local plan, The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan 2037: Regulation 19 Consultation Version (September 2020) (DLP). Having regard to paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I have insufficient information to determine the stage of preparation of the DLP or whether the referenced policies are the subject of any unresolved objections. As such, I afford the policies of the emerging plan limited weight in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The surrounding area is residential with a variety of property types, apparently constructed as part of the same development. Most properties are 2 storeys with a small number of 3 and 4 storey blocks of flats. The roofs within the area are predominantly unaltered with only a few rear dormers visible.
5. Although the dormer sits entirely within the roof slope and utilises matching materials, it would fill most of the slope. When viewed in combination with the existing single storey extension, the dormer would be disproportionate in scale and would dominate and largely square off the existing roof, as demonstrated by the other similarly designed dormers in the area. The alignment of the Juliette balcony does not relate to the existing elevation and would draw attention to the incongruous size and design of the dormer, contrary to the

Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document
(February 2012) (SPD).

6. While the dormer would only be minimally visible from Wanderer Drive, it would be a highly prominent feature from Great Galley Close and an unattractive addition to the street scene. Although other dormers are also visible, the angle at which they are viewed is less direct and their distance from the street is greater. In any event, they do not contribute positively to the area, their presence is therefore not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable developments.
7. Further, the cumulative effect of similarly sized dormers would be a cluttered roofscape, that would detract from the generally simple, unobtrusive and uniform appearance of the roofs within the area. However, the Council would retain control over future dormer extensions because of the removal of PD rights, consequently, I attach only limited weight to the precedent the dormer extension could set.
8. Nevertheless, overall, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area, in conflict with Policy D4 of The London Plan (March 2021), Policy CP3 of the Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (July 2010), Policy BP8 and BP11 of the Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (March 2011), Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD6 of the DLP, which together seek to ensure development recognises local character and promotes good design. There is also conflict with the SPD which seeks to ensure dormer windows relate to existing elevations. Similarly, there is conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character and is visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to the desire of the appellant to provide additional accommodation and I note the concern of the appellant that the existing bedrooms do not meet space standards. Be that as it may, the improved living conditions of the occupiers of the property does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the Framework. There are no other matters which would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Allen

INSPECTOR