Appeal Decision
Site visit made on 7 June 2018
by Les Greenwood MRTPi
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
Decision date: 25th June 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5060/D/18/3199759
67 Oulton Crescent, Barking IG11 9HF
- 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 Abdul Mukith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham.
- The application Ref 17/02072/FUL was refused by notice dated 6 February 2018.
- The development proposed is a double storey side extension.

Decision
1. The appeal is dismissed.

Clarification
2. The appellant’s statement asks for an amended plan to be considered as part of the proposal, but I have not received that plan. The submission of amended plans is not, in any case, generally appropriate within the householder appeal process because there is no opportunity for the Council or others to comment. I have considered this appeal on the basis of the plans on which the Council decided the application.

Main issues
3. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
   i) the character and appearance of the house and this part of Oulton Crescent; and
   ii) living conditions at the neighbouring house, 65 Oulton Crescent, in terms of the impact on outlook from that property.

Reasons
Character and appearance
4. Oulton Crescent 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 67 is fairly typical of the street, a 1930s style 2 storey, hipped roof, end of terrace house with a feature bay window at the front and a single storey garage to the side. The proposal is to replace or build over the garage to create a 2 storey side extension, built up to the side boundary and with a hipped roof. Although not included in the description of proposed
development, the proposal also includes a 2 storey/first floor extension at the back, building on or replacing an existing single storey section.

5. 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 infilled by extensions, but others remain open and are an important part of the street scene.

6. The adjacent house, 69 Oulton Crescent, has a 2 storey side extension which already partially closes down the visual gap between the 2 terraces. The appeal proposal would more or less complete this process, leaving just the space between the hipped roofs. It would effectively join up the terraces, blocking views and overdeveloping this part of the street to the detriment of the street scene. For the same reason, it would harm the character of the house, which would no longer clearly appear as an end of terrace property.

7. The Council mentions there being other similar local appeal decisions, with reference to 1 in particular\(^1\). I understand that the 2 storey side extension to the adjacent house (No 69) was allowed on appeal in 2012, before the adoption of the SPD, though I have not seen that decision. I also note the appellant’s reference to a pair of matching 1.5 storey side extensions nearby, but those are much different to the situation at 67 and 69 Oulton Crescent and I do not know their history. I have considered this proposal on its own merits in light of current circumstances.

8. I note the appellant’s argument that setting the first floor of the side extension in from the boundary, as the Council may have suggested, would have design implications of its own but that matter is not before me and I am not aware of any planning permission for such an alternative scheme. The appellant suggests that the side wall of the extension would be set in from the side boundary by 0.25m in order to allow for a roof overhang. This inset is not shown on the plans though.

9. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the house and of this part of Oulton Crescent. It therefore conflicts with the aims of Policies BP8 and BP11 of the Council’s Borough Wide Development Policies (BWDP) and the SPD, to ensure that development protects or enhances local character and helps to create a sense of local identity, distinctiveness and place.

**Living conditions**

10. The proposed rear extension would be deeper than the existing single storey section and would sit almost on the boundary with the next house in the terrace, No 65, very close to that house’s rear conservatory. This full height wall would tower over the conservatory to an extent that would be unduly oppressive and overbearing.

\(^1\) APP/Z5060/D/16/3151999
11. I note that the outlook from the rear of No 65 would otherwise remain fairly open. I nevertheless conclude that the proposal as shown on the application plans would unacceptably harm living conditions at this neighbouring house due to the impact on its outlook. The proposal therefore also conflicts with the aim of BWDP Policy BP11, to maintain residential amenity.

Other matters

12. I recognise the appellant’s reasonable wish to improve this home. I am not aware, however, of any specific need of such strength that it would override my objections in regard to the main issues.

Conclusion

13. 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