



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2024

by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/24/3349364
16 Wanderer Drive, Barking, IG11 0XJ

- 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 Aktar Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
 - The application Ref is 24/00663/HSE.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In September 2024, the Council adopted the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham Local Plan 2020 – 2037 (LP). Draft policies SP2 and DMD6 of that document were listed in the reasons for refusal. The new Local Plan was adopted after this appeal was lodged.
3. As a result of the adoption, Policy CP3 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2010) and Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Local Development Framework Borough Wide Development Policies Development Plan Document (2011) have been superseded and are no longer in force.
4. The text of draft Policies SP2 and DMD6 is largely unchanged insofar as they relate to this appeal, although the latter has been renumbered as Policy DMD 5 in the adopted Local Plan. The appellant had the opportunity to comment on the previously adopted and draft policies in submitting the appeal, and as the policies have not changed fundamentally it has not been necessary to seek further comments.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is an end-terrace house on a residential development of similarly styled buildings. Due to the road alignment, the property has an irregularly shaped, tapering plot, being wider at the front than at the end of the

- rear garden. The area of the proposal to the side is partly used for vehicle parking, and is therefore open and visible in the street scene.
7. I appreciate that the plot shape and width at this point are constraints, but by partly following the alignment of the boundary the proposal would result in an awkward design that would be out of keeping with the more traditional form of the host house. This would be particularly noticeable on the shallow pitched garage roof, which would sit awkwardly next to the simple porch and its lower eaves height. It would conflict with LP Policy DMD 5, which amongst other criteria requires an extension to be sympathetic and subordinate to the design of the original dwelling with regards to scale, form and detailing, and to seek to apply the same roof style as the original property in terms of pitch and eaves treatment. Whilst set back into the site, the extension and its roof form would be visible in views across the open driveway and that of the neighbouring property.
 8. Although the width of the proposed extension would be quite narrow towards its rear, when viewed from the front, alongside the existing façade and modest porch, it would appear disproportionately wide. As a result, it would not be subordinate in scale, as sought by LP Policy DMD 5 and guidance in the Council's 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD).
 9. Properties in the vicinity have original side garages and there are also some side extensions. However, these are generally set further back from the front elevation of the property, and with more traditional roof forms. As such, they have less visual impact on the property served and the street scene than proposed in this case. An exception cited by the appellant is at 28 Wanderer Drive. However, no details have been supplied of any planning permission granted for that development, and as such I do not know if it was considered under the same planning policies now in place. In any event, the design of that extension does not appear to be guided by an irregular boundary line, and the proximity to the neighbouring property limits views of it to a degree. Moreover, it is not typical in the street scene and on the basis of the available information I consider it offers limited support to the proposal.
 10. I am mindful of the reasoning for the design and forward siting of the proposal, and the impact of the foundation and insulation requirements on the build costs and internal space. Whilst I appreciate that an alternative design may not be cost effective for the appellant, this would not outweigh the visual harm that would arise from the form proposed.
 11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene. This would conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy D4 of The London Plan 2021; and with LP Policy SP2, which promotes high quality design which relates to its local context, and with LP Policy DMD 5, as supported by the SPD.
 12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR