



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: 13th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3337314

18 Eastbrook Drive, Rush Green, Romford, RM7 0YX.

- 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 Mr Tobin Frankland against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 23/01456/HSE.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property and the terrace of dwellings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 18 Eastbrook Drive (No 18) is a two-storey, end of terrace house. It has a steep pitched hipped roof. There is a later front porch and single storey rear addition. The house sits on a large garden plot.
4. No 16, the neighbouring dwelling, is one half of a semi-detached pair of houses set at 90 degrees to No 18 due to Eastbrook Road making a sharp right-angle turn in front of the properties. No 16 has an existing older style two-storey flat roof extension built up to the common boundary, which runs at 45 degrees between the Nos 16 and 18. Adjacent to, and parallel with the boundary to No 16 is a detached single storey garage.
5. The appellant proposes, following the demolition of the garage, the construction of a part single and part two-storey side extension built up to the boundary with No 16.
6. Prior to the construction of the two-storey extension to No 16 and the single story detached garage at No 18 there would have been a significant visual gap between Nos 16 and 18. However, this has already been appreciably denuded, therefore I do not consider, that in this case, the loss of the remaining visual gap between the two dwelling would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Further, a well-designed two-storey extension

here would have the benefit of reducing the prominence of the earlier extension to No16.

7. However, due to the desire to keep the three-dimensional form of the proposed extension subservient to Nos 16 and 18 the roof of the proposed extension would, as illustrated have a complex roof form. In this context this would be at odds with the form and design of the roof of the host property, the terrace and neighbouring dwellings.
8. On balance, therefore I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed extension would, as designed cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and the terrace of dwellings.
9. To allow the development as designed would therefore be contrary to the objectives of The National Planning Policy Framework, Policy D4 of the London Plan, Policy CP3 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (July 2010), Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Plan Document (March 2011), Pars 5.3 and 5.4 of the residential Extension and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2012), Policies SP2, DMD1 and DMD6 of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham's Draft Local Plan 2037 as they, amongst other things, relate to the quality of development, and the requirement to protect and enhance the character and amenity of the area.

Other Matters

10. In reaching my determination I have been mindful that the proposal would result in an improved internal layout of the existing house and would add to the range of dwelling sizes. However, given the harm that I have found I can only give these considerations very limited weight in the planning balance.
11. The development would not cause harm to the residential living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and would retain sufficient private amenity space for the dwelling. However, the absence of harm is a neutral factor in my considerations and, as such, I have given these matters very limited weight in my decision.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the lack of objection from neighbouring occupiers, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR