



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2023

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/22/3309875

73 Woodbridge Road, Barking, Barking and Dagenham IG11 9ES

- 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 Haris Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 22/01201/HSE, dated 11 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension and alteration to roof design.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension and alteration to roof design at 73 Woodbridge Road, Barking, Barking and Dagenham IG11 9ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01201/HSE, dated 11 July 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following submitted plans: drawing no. 19/111/001 – site location and block plan; and drawing no. 19/111/003 – proposed plans and elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council has also referred in its decision to policies within The London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan 2037 (Regulation 19 Submission Version, December 2021) (BDDLPP). I note that the draft plan is at Examination, and therefore at an advanced stage. However, at the current time it does not form part of the statutory development plan and I have not been made aware as to whether there are any unresolved objections in relation to the cited policies. I therefore attach limited weight to those policies in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace of dwellings of which it forms part, and the surrounding area, with particular regard to its scale and design.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end terraced property that has been extended to its side and rear elevations at ground and first floor. As a result, it features three different hipped roof heights on its front side and two different hipped roofs on its side elevation.
5. The terrace contains four properties, which occupy a corner position in a diagonal arrangement, fronting a small, grassed area at a crossroad junction. This arrangement gives the terrace a different building line to other properties that directly face onto adjoining roads, including Woodbridge Road. Whilst the terrace of dwellings in question has some variety in their external materials and fenestration, they all have distinctive paired round bay windows at ground and first floor with a small front projecting roof. The property at the opposite end of the terrace also has a hipped roof.
6. The area is characterised by terraced and semi-detached mainly hipped roof properties in an established residential area, many of which have been extended to the side at two storey level.
7. The proposed extension would bring the existing side extension forward making it parallel with the front elevation of the appeal property and the terrace of which it forms part. It would also simplify the roof design so that it would be in keeping with the remainder of the terrace. The proposed rounded bay windows whilst not presenting as a pair would provide balance to the host property and would maintain the rhythm of the terrace of properties, ensuring a balanced and sympathetic appearance.
8. I note that the proposal would make the appeal property larger, but it would not increase its existing width. In view of this, together with its sympathetic design, it being an end terraced property in a corner location, and in view of other local examples of side extensions cited by the appellant, the proposal would not constitute overdevelopment of the appeal site or be out of character with the surrounding area.
9. In coming to my decision, I have had regard to an earlier appeal decision that was dismissed for a conservatory on the host property (Ref:APP/Z5060/D/11/2157866). Albeit that proposal is in a similar location to the dismissed conservatory, the design of the proposal is significantly different and not directly comparable, therefore the earlier decision, whilst material does not alter my findings.
10. To conclude, the scale and design of the proposed extension would respect the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace of dwellings of which it forms part, and the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly the proposal complies with Policy CP3 of The Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham, Core Strategy, adopted July 2010, Policies BP8 and BP11 of The Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham, Borough Wide Development Policies, Development Plan Document, adopted March 2011, Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD6 of the draft BDDL, which amongst other things,

expect new development including residential extensions, to be high quality and respect the character and local distinctiveness of the area. The siting of the proposal and its relationship to other properties is also consistent with the objectives of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, adopted February 2012. In addition, the proposal complies with the requirements of paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that seeks to ensure new development adds to the overall quality of an area.

11. The Council's decision notice refers to the proposal being contrary to Policy D4 of The London Plan, adopted March 2021. Policy D4 concerns the use of tools for design analysis, design review processes and maintaining design quality through to completion, which I did not find to be relevant to the determination of this appeal.

Other Matters

12. I note the objection raised regarding loss of sun light to a nearby front bedroom window and how the proposal could affect sunlight and street view for a future extension at the side of the neighbouring property. I observed that the bedroom window has an open outlook towards the road and given the separation distance between the proposal and this window it would be unlikely that the proposal would reduce light to the bedroom window to a degree that would be harmful to the living conditions of this property's occupiers. I am unable to consider the effect of the proposal upon possible future extensions to the objector's property as I have no details of them, nor do I have any certainty that they will take place. From what I saw on site the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers is acceptable. It is noteworthy that the Council found similarly.

Conditions

13. I have imposed a standard implementation condition, along with a condition listing the approved plans to provide certainty over what has been approved. A materials condition is necessary to ensure the appearance of the extension matches that of the host property and to protect the appearance of the area. The new first floor bedroom window to the side elevation mainly faces onto the appellant's side garden and Woodbridge Road. I therefore do not find it necessary or reasonable to impose a condition requiring obscure glazing to that window. Nor do I find it necessary or reasonable to impose a condition to repeat the limitations of The Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 in respect of any subsequent first floor windows.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, considering the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, the appeal is allowed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR