



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2024

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3337522
120 Westrow Drive, Barking, IG11 9BP.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ishrat Mukadam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 23/01635/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear wrap-around extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I note the dialogue between the local planning authority and the appellant concerning suggested design changes raised during the determination of the planning application. However, I shall determine this appeal on the basis of the scheme design before me and upon which the Council's decision was made.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property and the character and appearance of the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 120 Westrow Drive (No 120) is a two-storey end of terrace property. The area is characterised by similar rows of terraces. The design of the houses in the terraces varies but are typical of the design of interwar period housing of the period. The houses in this particular terrace feature elegant curved projecting bay windows, simple projecting canopies over the front doors and hipped roofs.
5. While No 120, when viewed from the street remains virtually as originally designed, save for a replacement front door and windows, many of the nearby houses have been altered by the addition of enclosed porches and wrap around extensions.
6. The appellant proposes a single storey wrap around front, side and rear single storey extension.
7. The Council assert that the proposed 5.79 metre deep rear extension would serve to subsume the existing rear garden. However, based on the depth of the garden

compared to that of No 122 next door, which has a similarly deep rear extension, and the rear gardens of No's 124 and 126 I am not persuaded that this proposal would result in such a reduction in private amenity space as to cause significant harm to residential amenity.

8. While most of the nearby wraparound extensions have flat or mono pitched roofs facing the street, including the neighbouring dwelling No 122, the appellant proposes a shallow gable roof with deep bargeboards. The roof as designed would contrast with the pitch and form of the main roof and more importantly would not match or even relate sympathetically to that at No 122. Further, it would not reflect the 'modern' design style and detailing of the host property, where a flat roof might, subject to design, be more appropriate in this context of the original design of the house.
9. In addition, due to the cramped relationship of the new porch to the curved bay window this would detract further from the design and appearance of the original dwelling.
10. I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed extension by virtue of its roof design and relationship to the existing bay window would appear as an inappropriate and dominant addition that would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the wider area.
11. To allow the development would therefore be contrary to the objectives of The National Planning Policy Framework, Policy D4 of the London Plan (Adopted March 2021), Policy CP3 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted July 2010), Policy BP11 of the Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Plan Document (Adopted March 2011), Pars 5.3 and 5.4 of the Residential Extension and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted February 2012), Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD6 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan 2037 as they relate, along with other things, to the quality of development and the requirement to protect or enhance the character and amenity of the area.

Other Considerations

12. I have been referred me to other extensions and alterations nearby. Whatever the background to those cases, the existence of a similar developments nearby is not an appropriate justification for permitting another here, which I have considered on its individual design and planning merits.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and the Framework. Material considerations do not indicate a decision should be taken other than in accordance with the plan. Having considered all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR