
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2024

by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/23/3330652
58 Bevan Avenue, BARKING, IG11 9NP

- 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 G Jamali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref. 23/01013/HSE, dated 30 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey orangery style, double glazed conservatory to the side/end of the dwelling with a UPVC and glass lantern roof. Includes Fibreglass perimeter.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property, the terrace of which it forms part and the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is an end-terrace house on a corner plot which, despite being set back from the road, is prominent in the streetscene due to its position at a crossroads. The side boundary of the property is next to an open green space divided by a footpath, which mirrors that on the opposite side of Ben Tillet Close. However, whilst these green spaces create a sense of openness at the crossroads, the buildings around this junction vary in scale, form and siting, and do not materially contribute to any sense of space.
8. The terrace of which the appeal property forms part is already unbalanced, as the host property has been extended to the side in a manner not found at the opposite terrace end. However, there are few viewpoints where both ends of the terrace would be seen together, and as such the proposal would not cause material harm to the symmetry of the terrace.
9. Nevertheless, as a prominent corner plot, the lantern roof of the existing extension is a noticeable feature in the streetscene. That extension appears proportionate to the host dwelling, but the introduction of a further addition with a second lantern roof would create a large and dominant 'conservatory'-style structure that would be out of keeping with the form and architecture of the main house. The unbalanced spacing of the lanterns would add to the awkward appearance of the roof form. Although the design, materials and detailing may 'mimic' the existing extension, this would not mitigate the additional scale that the proposal would add to the side of the property. The impact would be at odds with the guidance in the Council's 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (REA), for side extensions to be particularly sympathetic in terms of their form, roof treatment and detailing.
10. However, I am mindful that there is a two-storey dwelling built up to the opposite side boundary of Ben Tillet Close, and large buildings on the other side of the crossroads. In this regard, I do not consider that the width of the addition would harm the openness of the corner

benefits of the additional accommodation for occupants of the appeal property, but in the manner proposed this would be at the expense of the character and appearance of the dwelling and the streetscene.

13. I therefore conclude that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property and the streetscene. It would conflict with the design objectives of the Framework, and with Policy D4 of The London Plan 2021, insofar as it seeks to deliver high quality design; and with Core Strategy¹ Policy CP3, which amongst other criteria expects high quality development which respects and strengthens local character and provides a sense of place. It would also be contrary to Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Council's Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document 2011, as supported by the REA, which together require all developments to protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area.
14. For the above reasons, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR

¹ Planning for the Future of Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy 2010