Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2018

by Les Greenwood  MRPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25th June 2018

Appel Ref: APP/Z5060/D/18/3200514
36 Stratton Drive, Barking IG11 9HJ

- 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 Sultan Ahmed and Mrs Aneesa Hoque against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/01929/FUL was refused by notice dated 17 January 2018.
- The development proposed is a new second storey side extension (with a 1.5m set back at the first floor on the front elevation) and a part double, part single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and this part of Stratton Drive.

Reasons

3. Stratton Drive is a residential street of terraced houses, mainly designed with hipped roofs on the end of rows and gaps at first floor level between the blocks of houses. No 36 is fairly typical of the street, a hipped roof 1930s style 2 storey end of terrace house with a feature bay window at the front and a single storey garage to the side. The proposal is to build over or replace the garage to create a 2 storey hipped roof side extension, set back by 1.5m at the front and built up to the side boundary. The extension would also wrap around to the back, adding to an existing single storey section to create a part 2 storey/part single storey extension.

4. The appellant suggests that the proposal would be set in from the side boundary. This is not, however, shown on the submitted plans as referenced on the application form and the Council’s notice of decision1.

5. 2 previous proposals for similar side extensions have been refused by the Council and dismissed on appeal2. I understand that the first of these was not

1 Proposed plans W(2)-02-01-RevC and W(2)-02-02-RevC
2 APP/Z5060/D/17/3171988 and APP/Z5060/D/18/3193205

https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate
inset at the side or the front. The second was apparently set in at the side by about 0.5m and set back a little at the front - both at first floor level.

6. The Council’s Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Extensions and Alterations (SPD)* expects that first floor side extensions will be set off the side boundary where the gaps between buildings contribute positively to the character of the area. The original layout here included gaps between the terraces at first floor and roof level. These gaps allow views, light and air through, giving some relief from the otherwise heavily built up nature of the street. Many have been either partially or fully closed, but others remain open and are an important part of the street scene.

7. Although this proposed new design would be set well back at the front at first floor level, this change would not significantly reduce the key visual impact. The gap between No 36 and the adjacent house would be half closed down, eroding this important local characteristic. Although I have considered this new proposal on its own merits, I find myself reaching a similar conclusion to those of the previous Inspectors. The proposed side extension would materially detract from the character and appearance of the area.

8. The Council has also referred to 2 appeal decisions relating to properties on a nearby street in the same neighbourhood3. I have noted those decisions, but again have considered this case on its own merits, in light of current circumstances.

9. I consider that the proposal would adequately respect the character of the house itself. The hipped roof and front set back would give it an appropriately subordinate appearance as seen from the street. I nevertheless conclude that it would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of this part of Stratton Drive due to its effect on the visual gap between the 2 terraces. It therefore conflicts with the aims of Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Council’s Borough Wide Development Policies and the SPD, to ensure that development protects or enhances local character and helps to create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place.

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

*Les Greenwood*
INSPECTOR

---

3 APP/Z5060/D/14/2213918 and APP/Z5060/D/16/3151999