
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2024

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/23/3327365
31 East Road, Chadwell Heath RM6 6XP

- 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 Euka against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref 23/00342/HSE, dated 8 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is to install a conservatory to rear of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. Planning decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Council has not cited a development plan policy in its reason for refusal. The Officer's report does, however, refer to relevant development plan policies within The London Plan (TLP), the Council's Planning for the future of Barking and Dagenham Core Strategy (CS) and its Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD), to which I have had regard.
3. Since the appeal was lodged, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. The Framework does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a mainly 2-storey semi-detached house that lies within a predominantly residential area. At the rear of the main dwelling is a ground floor projection with a flat roof that the Council estimates to be about 5-metres in length. The proposal is to introduce a conservatory with a mono-pitched roof that would extend rearwards from the existing ground floor projection.
6. The new addition would be modest in depth and height. However, the combined length of the existing rear projection and proposed conservatory would exceed the maximum threshold of 6-metres from the original rear wall

for this type of development as identified in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Extensions and Alterations* (SPD).

7. That the proposal would include a shallow pitched roof continuing at a slightly lower level from the existing flat roof would visually accentuate the bulk of the finished rear projection. In my opinion, the overly large 'box-like' appearance of the completed rear projection would relate uneasily with the modest scale, proportions, and hipped roof form of the main house. Taken together, these features would cause the proposal to be an unsympathetic addition that would visually dominate the rear elevation and detract from the intrinsic character of the appeal property. The scale and mass of the new built form would cause it to further unbalance the rear elevations of No 31 and its attached counterpart, which only includes a small dilapidated lean-to structure along its back wall.
8. As the new conservatory would be at the rear of the main house, it would not be readily evident from the road. Consequently, the character and appearance of the local street scene would remain unchanged if the appeal scheme were to proceed. Nevertheless, the appeal scheme would be visible from the back gardens of the properties on either side of the site. In these views, the appeal scheme would be seen together with the existing rear extension as an uncharacteristically large and obtrusive addition to the local area.
9. In reaching this conclusion, I acknowledge the 'lightweight' appearance of the conservatory with its uPVC frame and large glazed panels. I also saw that several properties along East Road and North Road include sizeable and prominent rear extensions, not all of which have respected the character of the host building and blended into the local area with success. These cases serve to illustrate that changes to a property can have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the area to which they belong. None of the examples that I observed involved a conservatory linked to a flat roof rear addition, as proposed. In any event, each proposal should be assessed on its own merits, as I have done in this instance.
10. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would materially harm the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, it is contrary to TLP Policy D4, CS Policy CP3, DPD Policy BP11 and the advice in the Council's SPD. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that new development achieves a high quality of design that protects the character of the local area. It is also at odds with the Framework, which seeks to ensure that all development is sympathetic to local character and adds to the overall quality of the area.
11. Once complete, the proposal would provide valuable additional living accommodation for the appellant's family. I am sympathetic to this desire. A good-sized garden would also remain with the new built form in place. However, these considerations do not outweigh the identified harm.
12. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane INSPECTOR